

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES

VOL. XLII

No. 7

JULY 1957

## THE LATIN OF THE NEW PSALTER

THE CLERGY REVIEW for February contained an interesting article by Fr L. Johnston, in which he attempted to pass judgement on the new Latin psalter in the light of its ten years of use. The chief criticism one could make of the article is that it gave little idea of the volume or content of the controversies during that period. As was explained in a footnote, the only sources were the *Motu Proprio* "*In cotidianis precibus*" and an article by Fr Bea, the person chiefly responsible for the form of the new psalter. There have been critics who have said that the translators have not followed the injunctions of the Holy Father, who commanded a new translation to be made which would both follow the original texts closely and take the Vulgate into account as far as possible.<sup>1</sup>

Much ink has flowed and much print has been published over the new psalter. The bibliographical pages of *Biblica* from 1945 onwards list a formidable amount of material. Three publications are of particular importance: by Professor Mohrmann of Nijmegen in 1948, by "La Maison-Dieu" in 1946, and by Fr Bea.<sup>2</sup> Professor Minuto of Milan in 1954 attempted a summary *status questionis* of the various criticisms and the replies they met with.<sup>3</sup> This has two parts: the reconstitution of the original text, and the Latin translation. The first part has two sections, of which the first compares the Hebrew text preferred by the translators with that preferred by other scholars. The second section compares procedures when the text seems in need of

<sup>1</sup> "... novam Psalmorum latinam conversionem apparari iussimus, quae et textus primigenios presse fideliterque sequeretur, et veteris venerandae Vulgatae aliarumque antiquarum interpretationum, quantum fieri posset, rationem haberet." *In cotidianis precibus*.

<sup>2</sup> C. Mohrmann: The new Latin psalter; its diction and style. English translation by Abbot Justin McCann, *American Benedictine Review*, Vol. IV, No. 1, Spring 1953.

<sup>3</sup> "La Maison-Dieu", cahier no. 5 (1946), pp. 60-106. This consists of nine articles by various authors.

A. Bea: *Il nuovo Salterio Latino* (Rome, 1946), translated into other languages in the following years.

<sup>4</sup> F. Minuto: Dopo la nuova versione latina dei salmi (*Aevum*, July-August 1954, pp. 301 ff.)

reconstruction. The translators have taken intelligibility as their guiding principle and have therefore given an important place to conjecture, whereas critics have preferred a more conservative method. Fr Bea gives five cases as examples of the necessity of critical conjecture. Of these, one is judged cogent, three unnecessary and one unacceptable. The second part, dealing with the Latin, has three sections. The first concerns the controversy over the poetic nature of the translation. Intelligibility is the watchword of the translators, whereas their critics say that poetry needs shade as well as light. The next section concerns the choice of Classical Latin as the most worthy medium for the new psalter. This is energetically combated by scholars of Christian Latin, who insist that by the fourth century the latter was the cultured literary language and that pagan Latin is an inadequate medium for revelation. Professor Mohrmann's article, cited above, is most important here. A final section deals with Christian tradition, liturgy and so on. The author ends on a judicial note: the new psalter should be considered as a stage on the way. It is the culmination of desires for a more accurate psalter but also the starting-point for further work.

The present article will confine itself to the Latin of the new psalter. To avoid any false impression, let it be stated at once that if criticism outweighs praise, it is because of the nature of the article. The gain in intelligibility—*pace* those Hebrew scholars who disagree with the procedure adopted—is immense and so is the improvement in translating the Hebrew verb tenses. The Gallicanum (our old breviary psalter) contained certain obscurities and harshnesses which are better out of the way. These improvements, however, will not be dwelt upon. Attention will be focussed on the ways in which the new psalter falls short of perfection, bearing in mind Professor Minuto's remark that it should be looked upon as a basis for future research.

#### CHOICE OF LATIN

Fr Johnston notes that the changes in the Latin introduced by the translators are objected to on the contradictory grounds

of pedantry and ignorance and concludes that the objections therefore weaken, if they do not cancel, each other. This might possibly be so if contradictory arguments were used against the same rendering, but it is not impossible for a translator to be pedantic in one instance and show his ignorance in the next. And even if contradictory objections are made against the same rendering, one may be justified and the other not; not all critics and criticisms have the same weight. He says elsewhere: "Each of us will tend to pass judgement according to the amount of Latin that we ourselves have acquired." Not necessarily. There are objective standards of literary and linguistic criticism. The impression is given that if the new psalter is in simple, lucid Latin, that is the end of the matter. "Surely the main criterion of any translation should be: Does it allow us to see the meaning? Is it understandable?"

But there is much more to be said. There is no such thing as unqualified, absolute Latin, any more than there is unqualified English or French or Icelandic. There is colloquial Latin and literary Latin, Latin of the first century B.C., and Latin of each century before and after, Latin used by pagans and Latin used by Christians, and so on. We have enough texts of all ages from the third century B.C. onwards to follow the ever evolving structure and styles. Informed criticism of the new translation must judge whether it is too literary, too colloquial or just right; whether it is the Latin of one epoch or a hotch-potch of different epochs; whether it is the Latin of pagans or the Latin of Christians. St Jerome, living in the fourth century, wrote fourth-century Latin; being a Christian, he wrote as a Christian would. It is not the same for a modern translator, who must choose his style and his epoch.

The translators themselves have spoken plainly about their guiding principles in this regard.<sup>1</sup> They speak of the difficulties of the Gallicanum: non-Latin use of tenses, hebraisms and the use of words which do not exist or mean something else in Classical Latin. All these things have been carefully avoided. However, not only have the words of the Vulgate been retained where there is no objection on the grounds of text, rhythm or

<sup>1</sup> *Liber Psalmorum* (editio altera, 1945), Prologomena. De novae interpretationis lingua et dictione, pp. xx-xxii.

language, but if they could not be kept, words have generally been chosen from among those in use in the rest of the Vulgate. Hence, it is hoped, the Latin will not be dissimilar to that of the liturgy and yet will conform to the laws of Classical Latin. Words proper to the Jewish and Christian religions have been retained, even if they are not found or have different meanings in the ancient writers; so too have certain frequent or typical Hebrew expressions.

This explanation of the translators is clear and seems satisfactory enough: the new psalter will be in a Latin which obeys the Classical rules, although vocabulary will be as like the Vulgate as is compatible with correctness. But is it satisfactory? The framework is the Latin of the pagan authors of the first century B.C. and into it are introduced expressions of the Christians of the fourth century A.D. Even if we take the view that one cannot have anachronisms in a dead language, it is at the very least a hybrid production.

What induced the translators to follow such a course? They were forced by the nature of their material to include words expressive of concepts of the Jewish and Christian religions, even though many of these concepts had been translated into Latin by post-Ciceronian Christians. One cannot express revelation in the language of pagans who are ignorant of it; if one does not create new words, one must give new meanings to old words. Why then did they adopt a Classical framework? They tell us themselves. They refer to it as "*melior lingua latina*" and its authors as "*melioris aetatis scriptores*". They have chosen an idiom "*quae . . . potius melioris aetatis latinitem sequatur quam labentes posteriorum temporum usus*".<sup>1</sup> Fr Bea elsewhere refers to Church Latin as *scadente* (decadent) and *volgare*.<sup>2</sup>

Now, such terminology cannot be accepted by students of linguistics. All languages are always evolving and are never static until they die. There is no permanent standard of usage and no such thing as "better" or "best" usages or epochs. It thus cannot be said that the language of one epoch is better than that of another, or that language is decadent in one age as

<sup>1</sup> Liber Psalmorum, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> Bea, op. cit., pp. 107-15. Minuto, loc. cit., p. 319.



compared with another. All that can be said is that one developed into, or is the development of, another. One age may produce better writers, the language may have a greater vocabulary or expressiveness and so forth, but it is not a better form of the language. Literary styles may be decadent, but not the language. Or rather, decay in language is a synonym for change and is the normal, constant condition of all languages. Classical Latin is merely the literary language at a certain point of time.

What the translators have done, then, is to use what is not a better Latin but rather the Latin used by those pre-Christian authors whom they consider superior as writers. How far is this justified? To give an answer one must see Classical and Church Latin in their historical setting.<sup>1</sup> The literary men of the first century B.C. had striven to make Latin a medium of expression for all Hellenistic culture. They worked upon their language, coining new words and giving new meanings to words already in use, yet avoiding Greek words as much as possible. Even more important than their additions were their rejections; Greek terms of commerce and everyday life and colloquial words with expressive prefixes and suffixes were rigidly excluded from their literary compositions. In fact, Classical Latinity is a retrenchment rather than anything else, an exclusion of colloquial elements. Certain words and constructions were found in early writers; they were rejected by the Classical authors but never ceased to be used and were common in the Fathers. Cicero himself did not scruple to use them in his letters.<sup>2</sup>

This artificial literary language was cultivated by relatively few Latin speakers and had very little effect on the later development of Latin. Its syntax is that of the first century B.C., shorn of its more colloquial constructions. Four centuries later many of the latter had become the literary usage—a normal happening in a living language—while many of the Classical

<sup>1</sup> The present writer has treated of this more at length in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, April 1954, pp. 213 ff., "Latin as a living language".

<sup>2</sup> This duality of style can be paralleled in English. Dr Johnson, having noted of a certain play: "It has not wit enough to keep it sweet", later produced this opinion in a period ending: "sufficient to preserve it from putrefaction". Again, instead of "a dirty fellow bounced out" he described him as "black as Cyclops from the forge". These are quoted from memory.

constructions had perished. By St Jerome's day Cicero's writings were in part no longer intelligible without previous study, like the Elizabethans to us—likewise four centuries distant. It could not be expected that St Jerome should write in Ciceronian Latin. His subject-matter prevented him from imitating Cicero's style, which was the style of literary artifice. He could not confine himself to Cicero's constructions and vocabulary, for many were archaic and obsolete. The question of Cicero's Latin being better did not arise and should not arise today.

In any case, St Jerome was writing about things completely unknown to Cicero. If a group of men lives in particular circumstances or deals with particular objects or ideas, that group develops its own vocabulary. The early Christians were no exception. They added new, Christian meanings to pagan words and introduced new words into their vocabulary. Many of these were of Greek origin, others were colloquial; but eventually they became native and literary. The first Christians tended to reject Classical Latin for several reasons: they belonged to lower social strata for the most part and they were not enamoured of its artificial and pagan nature.<sup>1</sup> When Christianity became socially acceptable, its literary men did not revert to the old Classical Latin but continued the Christian tradition. Their language thus became the literary norm. As Christianity advanced and paganism receded, so did the corresponding literary styles. In the end the non-Christians became known as "pagani", which means "rustics, dwellers in the country".

The notion is only too widespread that the Fathers of the Church were holy men, learned in theology and the things of the spirit but unacquainted with profane scholarship—*sapienter indoctus*, as St Gregory says of St Benedict. In the case of St Jerome nothing could be further from the truth. He was probably one of the greatest scholars that the western world has ever known. The Collect for his feast describes him as "in exponendis Sacris Scripturis. . . Doctorem maximum". As a linguist he was outstanding; his knowledge of antiquities was

<sup>1</sup> For an account of early Christian Latin and its subsequent social ascent, see Mohrmann, loc. cit., pp. 15-21.

profound. By his own acknowledgement he was a fervent admirer and student of Cicero, although he wrote in a more modern idiom. The suggestion that St Jerome was not skilled in the finer points of the Latin tongue is absurd. The Fathers wrote good Latin, grammatically and syntactically correct. One has only to compare what they wrote with the less educated writers to realize this at once. The Apostles may have been fishermen, tax collectors and so on, but the Fathers were the scholars of their day. If they turned their backs on profane learning, it was because they knew it too well, not because they were ignorant of it.

It can now be seen what the translators of the new psalter have done. At the risk of labouring the point, an example nearer home may be given. Suppose that Dark Ages follow our century (by no means unlikely!) and English becomes the liturgical language of Christendom. Mgr Knox's Bible, somewhat contaminated by the Douai version, has survived. Biblical scholars decided on a new translation and insist on the English of Dr Johnson because he is in their view the greatest English prose writer. Suppose, too, that Dr Johnson's century knew nothing of Christianity and had no such words as "baptism" or "sacrament". There could be two opinions on the wisdom of the translators' aims.

#### RESULTS OF THE CHOICE MADE

What has the new psalter gained or lost in its new Latin dress? Few would deny that it has gained in clarity and lost in felicity, melodiousness, poetry—a severe enough loss, especially if it is to be used in public worship. We could hardly expect otherwise, granted that the translators aimed at intelligibility above all else, and granted that they could not hope to equal St Jerome, who was a peerless translator rendering into his mother tongue. Here we shall concern ourselves with things more tangible than clarity and poetry. Now, the translators expressed the hope that the Latin of the new psalter would not differ much from that used in the Liturgy, but a comparison with the Gallicanum reveals great changes in vocabulary and

idiom. Fr Johnston himself wondered why *clipeus* and *pene*s should be preferred to *scutum* and *apud*.<sup>1</sup> Undoubtedly the latter are the more popular words. A fairly good test is to look up a Romance etymological dictionary and see if the words survived into the Romance languages. If they did, they were unquestionably words used in ordinary speech, which of course did not prevent them from being also in literary use. If they did not survive, it means they either died a natural death or never had a natural life. *Scutum* and *apud* survived into Romance, the other two died.

The vitality of spoken Latin showed itself in the constant coining of new words. They usually had a prepositional prefix or one of the various suffixes, sometimes both. Thus we get *exaltare*, *contristare*, *supervacue*, *perambulare*, *subsannatio*, *deglutire*; *tribulatio*, *conventiculum*, *juvencula*, *plenitudo*, *visitare*, verbs in *-ifico* (*mirifico*, *glorifico*, etc.). The intensive suffixes like *per-*, *con-*, *ex-* and the diminutives like *-ulus*, *-iculus* gradually lost their force until they were the normal form of the word. The new psalter tends to reject these compounds in the same way as it tends to reject all other non-Classical words. Sometimes the popular word is retained, occasionally it is even inserted where it was not before; but on the whole it is rejected. The result is a loss of colour and energy. *Tristis*, *captivus*, *fulmen* are weaker than *contristatus* (greatly saddened), *compeditus* (fettered), *coruscatio* (a flashing). Words like *converto*, *exaudio*, *perduco*, *perambulo* are frequently reduced to their simple form; *canto* becomes *cano*; and so forth. Examples could be multiplied. Non-Classical words or words with non-Classical meanings, such as *novella* (a shoot), *abusio* (abuse, contempt), are replaced. Many of the words rejected were of Greek origin: *nycticorax*, *episcopatus* (office, duty), *zelare*, *lebes*, *abyssus*, *coenomyia* (*kynomyia*, a dog-fly). These Greek words were originally of popular, not learned, origin.

One of the most characteristic features of Indo-European languages is the gradual elimination of grammatical inflexions in favour of such devices as word order, auxiliary verbs, prepositions and so forth. Where formerly one word with a special ending was employed, two words took its place. This process

<sup>1</sup> The *Liber Psalmorum* in a note to Psalm 34 explains that there are two Hebrew words for "shield" which correspond to *clipeus* and *scutum*.

has been going on at varying speeds for several thousand years, in Latin as in other languages. Latin before Cicero was more inflected than in his day, Latin after him was less inflected. Therefore when the translators of the new psalter omit the preposition *in*, they are putting the clock back four centuries. They are trying to make a case ending perform the function that prepositions were taking over more and more. Thus they give "laudate eum tympano" (Ps. 150) and "die irae suae" (Ps. 109) without *in*.

In the same way they substitute the Accusative and Infinitive construction for the clause introduced by *quod*, *quia* or *quominus*: "sciant gentes quoniam homines sunt" becomes "sciant gentes se homines esse" (Ps. 9, 21). This is a similar putting back of the clock. The Accusative and Infinitive was gradually replaced by the *quia* clause, which alone survives into the modern Romance languages. Changes in syntax such as these last two contribute greatly to the new psalter having so different a rhythm from St Jerome's.

St Jerome, like his predecessors, translated as literally into Latin as possible. Hence, if there was any Latin construction like the corresponding one in Greek or Hebrew, great use was made of it. This happened with the *quia* construction just mentioned, which was native to Latin but coincided with Greek usage. Obviously this does not make such a construction any less native. Many such constructions have unfortunately been labelled hebraisms, although they are found as native growths in other languages, Latin among them. It is now generally recognized that genuine hebraisms in the Vulgate are fewer than was formerly thought. The new translation rejects, presumably on the grounds that they are hebraisms, many idioms which were native to Latin.

The new psalter tends to substitute concrete expressions for abstract nouns used with a concrete meaning; thus "patrant iniqua" for "operantur iniquitatem" (Ps. 5, 6). Such abstract nouns were, however, used in Latin from pre-Classical times onwards and were a native growth.<sup>1</sup> The same is true of the "intensive" genitive, which is common to all Indo-European languages. Certainly in English we can say "day of days",

<sup>1</sup> For these so-called hebraisms, see Mohrmann, loc. cit., pp. 27-31.

"game of games" to mark exceptional specimens. The new psalter therefore need not have rejected "*saeculum saeculi*" so often.

No less than twenty-five times the verb "to be" has been inserted where St Jerome omitted it. Yet its omission is common to European languages and great play was made of it in Latin writers of all periods, e.g. "*verbum satis sapienti*". It is found in English ("Theirs but to do and die"—Tennyson) and is the rule in such disparate languages as Gaelic and Russian. Finally, the new psalter rejects the singular of multitude. Again it was common in Latin. The populace used to cry "*Christianos ad leonem*" and Caesar, a classical author, was very fond of using "miles", "eques", etc., for the plural, just as we in English speak of "shooting duck". Quite clearly these four idioms could be allowed to stand. Their removal not only unnecessarily widens the gap between the old and new psalters, but also robs the new translation of colour.

Loss of colour and energy is as nothing compared with the real loss of Christian association and content. Christian writers, as we have seen, tended to adopt usages which were more colloquial and natural than those of the Classical authors. The new translation is thus couched in a Latin which Christian writers did not use. It is dissociated from them in its language and stands apart from that great body of writing—great both naturally and supernaturally—the works of the Latin Fathers. The gulf is widened and the loss increased by the rejection of expressions that were specifically Christian. Chief among these are the verbs ending in *-ifico*. They have been rejected entirely with only one exception: *magnifico* has been retained in the Magnificat itself and a few other instances where it occurs alongside *Deus* or *Dominus*. We have only to see the extent of their use in the Vulgate, where they occupy column after column in the concordance, to realize the gravity of this. They are prominent in the New Testament: "*Mortificatus quidem carne, vivificatus autem spiritu*" (I Pet. iii, 18). "*Sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, ita et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur*" (I Cor. xv, 22). "*Qui justus est, justificetur adhuc; et sanctus, sanctificetur adhuc*" (Apoc. xxii, 11). Throughout Romans and Galatians *justifico* is a key word; e.g. "*Justificati ergo ex*

fide" (Rom. v, 1); following this, the Council of Trent has consecrated the term. *Sanctifico* is used in the Our Father and the Canon of the Mass. The word *honoro* is found in the Vulgate besides *honorifico*, but the latter was the more solemn for Lactantius.<sup>1</sup> Hence the words of Christ: "Honorifico Patrem meum" (Jn. viii, 49).

Another serious loss concerns the verb *confiteor*. In Christian Latin it meant to confess one's sins, to acknowledge one's faith, and to praise God. We have retained the first two in the double meaning (and pronunciation?) of English "confessor"; the third is excellently brought out in Heb. viii, 15: "Per ipsum ergo offeramus hostiam laudis semper Deo, id est, fructum laborum confitentium nomini ejus." The words of Christ in Mt. xi, 25, are: "Confiteor tibi, Pater, Domine caeli et terrae, quia abscondisti haec a sapientibus." In fact, *confiteor* in this sense is used only with God. In the psalms, where *confiteor* usually has this meaning, the translators have substituted *laudo*, etc. For the early Christian, however, *confiteor* was one word, not three. Admitting his sins, acknowledging his God and extolling His goodness were not kept rigidly distinct. St Augustine's Confessions are no mere confession of sin. He brings out the multiple meaning of the title in the passage: "Accipe sacrificium confessionum mearum de manu linguae meae . . . ut confiteatur nomini tuo" (Confessions, v, 1). In the new psalter this Christian word is shorn of a third of its meaning.

*Propitior* and *propitiatio* have also been rejected, whereas they have entered our theological language, particularly as regards the Mass. *Abyssus* has gone, presumably because it is a Greek loan-word. Apart from its evocative nature—"abyssus abyssum invocat" is sheer poetry—it has entered the vocabulary of Christendom. We speak of "demons of the abyss", following the Apocalypse, and it even penetrated into Old Irish, so that it provides the word for "devil" in the Scottish Gaelic version of the Leonine prayers. We invoke the Sacred Heart as "abyss of all virtues".

The noun *salutare* has been modified to *salus*. We are the losers, for the difference between them is not one of literary respectability but of meaning. Christian writers usually use

<sup>1</sup> Mohrmann, loc. cit., p. 20.



*salus* with reference to us but *salutare* always with reference to God. *Salus* had also retained its original meaning of bodily health, whereas *salutare* had no such earthly connotations. The seemingly coarse *eructare* ("to vomit, belch", especially of a drunk man) was used of utterances inspired by the Holy Spirit—"sobriam ebrietatem Spiritus", as the hymn puts it. It had no longer its coarse meaning for a Christian, rather this dignified one,<sup>1</sup> but the new translation rejects it. The word *magnalia*, also excluded, was created by the Christians to express the works of the true God. It had at once a wider and more spiritual meaning than *portenta*.

For a final example let us take *veritas*, which is usually changed to *fidelitas*, a word completely absent from the Vulgate. When applied to God *veritas* does mean fidelity to his promises but it has deep messianic connotations totally absent from *fidelitas*. According to Fr Dubarle, O.P.,<sup>2</sup> *veritas* is one of the most important religious concepts of the Old Testament. Just as *Sapientia* connotes the Word of God, so does *Veritas*. Christ said, "Ego sum . . . veritas" (Jn. xiv, 6) and the Fathers have accordingly seen messianic foreshadowing in the Psalms: "Veritas Domini manet in aeternum" (Ps. cxvi, 2), "Veritas de terra orta est" (Ps. lxxxiv, 12). In the messianic 88th Psalm it occurs eight times. Our Lord said to the Samaritan woman: "Veri adoratores adorabunt Patrem in spiritu et veritate" (Jn. iv, 23). St Athanasius sees this as the worship of the Trinity: adoring the Father in the Spirit and the Son.

It must be emphasized that these Christian words, whatever their origin, were respectable and literary by the fourth century. One must also be clear on their significance. They may not invariably have a sacred or theological meaning in every text where they occur, but they are the words to which that sacred or theological meaning was attached. For example, *justifico* and *veritas* have their profane as well as their Christian meanings, in the same way as our "justify" and "truth" have both. Even if the Psalmist was unaware of what his songs were to signify in Christian revelation, they still, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, foreshadowed that revelation. There-

<sup>1</sup> Mohrmann, loc. cit., pp. 25-6.

<sup>2</sup> Maison-Dieu, loc. cit., pp. 94-6. Minuto, loc. cit., p. 327.

fore these words cannot be rejected without serious loss. Tradition, likewise inspired by God, adopted the same words (these two examples will again serve) in the New Testament texts where they have a theological meaning and also in the psalter.<sup>1</sup> Even if they have no such doctrinal content in the psalter—an assertion that few would dare to make—they have nevertheless doctrinal and Christian connotation. They are the words placed there by early Christian tradition and they have been pondered over and worked upon by Christians ever since. Even were there no loss in doctrinal content, there would still be a very strong case for their retention wherever possible.

#### LATIN FOR PRIESTS TODAY

The translators no doubt regret these losses and did not gladly incur them. They were induced by the twofold belief that Church Latin is inferior to Classical and that the education of priests today fits them for Classical rather than Church Latin. There is really no doubt as to the first consideration. It is simply not so, and scholars are coming more and more to realize the fact, albeit prejudice dies hard.

The second is a less academic issue. Setting aside academic questions of what sort of Latin it ought to be, let us take the new psalter as it is. It is not easy to compare the difficulty of its Latin with that of the Gallicanum, because so many other considerations enter in. We cannot compare passages where the meaning or the use of tenses is different, for that involves other factors besides. We are really reduced to taking short samples, individual expressions in fact. Here one can agree with Fr Johnston that assessment of difficulty is subjective. He considers that *celebro* is clearer than *confiteor* for "to praise"; but is it? That is a minor and not very obvious meaning of *celebro*. The obvious word is *laudo*. Is *tentorium* also clearer than *tabernaculum*? Surely no intelligent reader is confused by our English "tabernacle". Is *sublevo* really an obvious word for "to help"?

<sup>1</sup> This harmonizing of Old and New Testaments took place in the Greek language, into which the Septuagint was translated and which was the language of early Christianity. Some Hebrew scholars adduce this as an argument in favour of the Greco-Latin manuscript tradition in establishing the text of the Psalter.

*Dilatasti mihi* means "widened (the way) for me"; if one is to use the obvious word, why not *juvo*, *subvenio*, *succurro*?

The above merely shows that not everybody responds alike to Latin words. Further examples may make the position clearer. The new psalter substitutes *puella* for *juvencula*, *temere* or *sine causa* for *supervacue*. The new terms are without doubt the better known. On the other hand, it introduces such words as *sensa* and *aulaeum*, which one can hardly call well known. All will agree that both psalters offer occasional difficulties in their Latin.

Where the new psalter has removed hebraisms, its Latin cannot help being more straightforward. At the same time, those hebraisms did not make the Latin obscure. "In saeculum saeculi", "Deus iudex justus" without "est", "venit locusta" for the plural—these offer no difficulty. Neither does the use of abstract nouns for concrete things, for it is a habit of our modern western languages to give concrete meanings to words like union, government, weakness, iniquities.

In general, Church Latin is easier for us moderns than Classical. Even leaving aside the latter's rather formal and artificial nature, the looser and freer syntax of the later Latin is more in conformity with our modern languages. The greater use of prepositions helps us, for we have the same: *in die*—*in* the day, *in cithara*—*on* a harp. A *quod*, *quia* clause for Accusative and Infinitive is also simpler, since it is the common practice in modern Germanic, Slavonic, Celtic and Romance languages to express noun clauses so: *Sciant gentes quoniam homines sunt*—*that* they are men (Ps. ix, 21). The shortness of the Psalm verses prevents the change of syntax from having much effect, but the increased difficulty caused by putting continuous passages into Classical Latin would be immense. The result of re-writing the Bible in Classical Latin would be to put it beyond the reach of most priests.

It is possible, however, that although Classical Latin is more difficult in itself it is easier for the priest who has been brought up to it. As we have seen, the new psalter still contains expressions rejected by or unknown to Classical authors, but they are few in numbers compared with the Gallicanum. But should not the issue here be made one of principle rather than

expediency? Let upholders of the two opposing views be quoted. Fr Johnston says: "It seems rather pointless to insist that church students should spend many years learning Latin, and then, at the end of it, to give them as the Latin text they are to use most in their lives, a book containing quite a different kind of Latin." Dr Mohrmann says: "If the education of priests is of such a character that they learn a species of Latin which they hardly encounter again throughout their lives, whereas they cannot understand the form of Latin with which they are in daily contact, then it were better to reform their education than to change the ancient texts."<sup>1</sup>

It is certainly true that the average priest will not meet much Classical Latin after leaving the minor seminary and will meet much Church Latin. The rest of the Vulgate is couched in the Latin rejected by the new psalter. The lessons of the Breviary are in this Latin; so are the various parts of the Mass, both ordinary and proper. The Fathers of course wrote in it. The schoolmen, whose mother tongue was not Latin, used a Latin based on Scripture and the Fathers. It is no use saying that a seminarist is used to the Accusative and Infinitive, therefore the *quod* construction should be avoided. He will come up against it everywhere, not least in St Thomas's frequent "Videatur quod non sit . . .". The Vulgate, for good or ill, has influenced all Latin since the days of St Jerome. The fact just has to be accepted.

The verbs in *-ifico* are solidly established in modern Europe, both in Latin and the vernaculars, and cannot be expelled. The words "mortify", "justify", "sanctify" have become commonplace to express Catholic thought; holy men are "beatified", Our Lady's feast is the "Purification", and so forth. The word *confiteor* in its meaning of "to praise" is a favourite example on both sides. As Fr Johnston says, "The normal student . . . could learn to put that meaning into it, but why should he, when he already knows the word *celebrare*?" But if the seminarist does not understand *confiteor* with this meaning in the Psalms, he will not understand it in the Epistles and Gospels. If the whole Bible is rewritten, he will still not understand it in the Breviary lessons, which comment on Scripture according to the

<sup>1</sup> Mohrmann, loc. cit., p. 31.

Vulgate text, and in Aquinas. The Fathers were steeped in Scripture and used its language even when not quoting directly. St Benedict for instance says to his monks: "Et nocte surgamus ad confitendum ei", quite clearly alluding to the Psalm verse "Media nocte surgebam ad confitendum tibi". So with the Fathers generally. We cannot change all the texts, so surely it would be an easier and more satisfactory solution to outline to major seminarists, either in their Scripture or Patrology course, the main features of Christian Latin.

The translators have rendered a great service by presenting the Psalms in a text free from obscurities. Fr Bea himself speaks of future emendations. It is to be hoped that these will include a return, where clarity and textual accuracy do not demand otherwise, to the vocabulary and style of St Jerome. A version of the Psalms which increased their intelligibility while departing as little as possible from the language that Christians for centuries have known and loved and made their own—this would indeed be a pearl beyond price.

MARK DILWORTH, O.S.B.

---

#### FR PAUL PAKENHAM, PASSIONIST

ONE of the most surprising and attractive converts of the whole Second Spring period has been brought into recent prominence by the centenary celebrations of the first Passionist foundation in Ireland at Mount Argus, Dublin. That flourishing mother house, which has since produced many offshoots and missions elsewhere, was first opened in August 1856. Its first rector was a young convert, who died within barely six months of founding the house at Mount Argus. He had not been in Dublin long enough to become widely known; but it was recognized that he belonged to a most distinguished Irish family. He had sacrificed a life of great promise in the family tradition, when he became a Catholic and a Passionist. The Honourable

Charles Reginald Pakenham was the fourth son of the second Earl of Longford, whose family owned large estates in county Westmeath and around Dublin. He was also a nephew, by marriage, of the great Duke of Wellington. No other member of his family had shown any sympathy whatever with the Tractarian movement in England, and they generally shared the traditional distrust of Romanism and of the Catholic Church in Ireland. His decision to become a Catholic in 1850, and a Passionist very soon afterwards, remains almost unexplained, even in the biography<sup>1</sup> which was written by one of the Irish Passionists, after collecting all possible information.

Charles Pakenham was born in Dublin at Longford House, Rutland Square, on 21 September 1821. His mother, Georgiana Emma Charlotte Lygon, was a daughter of the first Earl Beauchamp. His father's sister, Lady Katherine Pakenham, had married the Duke of Wellington in 1806. Very little information concerning his early years survives. He appears to have been at a preparatory school at Richmond, Surrey. His three brothers all went to Winchester, but no record survives of Paul's having been there, and he entered Sandhurst in May 1835 before he was yet fourteen. In June 1839 he was gazetted as Ensign to the 72nd Regiment (the Seaforth Highlanders) who were at that time stationed in the Barbadoes. He had to report there on being commissioned, but only had to stay for a few weeks. By October 1841 he had become a Lieutenant in his regiment. Early in 1846 he obtained a captaincy in the 69th Foot (the Welsh Regiment) and in October of the same year he was transferred as Captain to the Grenadier Guards. About the time when he had entered Sandhurst as a boy of fourteen, his father had died, and the chief influence upon his life thereafter was his uncle, Major-General Lygon, a brother of Lord Beauchamp, who had no children of his own and more or less treated Charles Pakenham as a son. General Lygon was for a time Inspector-General of Cavalry, and young Pakenham appears to have served as his A.D.C. Then the General retired to his place in Worcestershire.

In 1846 Charles Pakenham had only reached the age of twenty-five. There is no apparent reason why he should have

<sup>1</sup> *Paul Mary Pakenham, Passionist*, by Rev. Joseph Smith, C.P., Gill, Dublin, 1930.

been deeply influenced by the conversion of Newman at Littlemore, which had occurred a year earlier. The Longford family were not particularly concerned with church affairs, either in Ireland or in England. The Tractarian movement had been split irrevocably by Newman's conversion, and by the condemnation at Oxford of W. G. Ward's book on *The Ideal Church*. Newman himself had gone to Rome to prepare for his ordination and to make plans for organizing the Oratory in Birmingham, which did not materialize until several years later. Charles Pakenham, as an industrious young officer, had no obvious contacts with the strangely assorted company of converts who were following Newman's path in seeking admission to the Catholic Church. His biographer, Fr Smith, produces no evidence to support the pious belief that he was converted from a dissipated youth. Fr Tenison Woods, who recorded his personal memories long afterwards, declares that Pakenham himself used to say as a Passionist that "he led a wild and dissipated life at this time"; but he had been obviously "too studious, retiring and temperate to be dissipated". He had indeed told Fr Tenison Woods that, at this same time, he used to spend six or eight hours a day in study if he could find the time; and that in this way he had acquired a knowledge of four or five modern languages.

Some decisive change, however, appears to have occurred about the time when he transferred from the Welsh Regiment to become a Captain in the Grenadier Guards. On 15 October that year, just five days before his transfer, he inscribed his name in the fly-leaf of a small commonplace book of about 150 pages which he kept diligently thereafter. He copied into it many short extracts from his reading. Fr Smith gives an account of this treasured book: "As we turn over the pages of this old notebook, yellowed with age and covered with the lines of faded ink, that hold the refined and delicate, almost feminine handwriting of the young officer, it is curious to observe how everything he read, even the unlikeliest things, helped his mind towards gathering that happy bias which led to his subsequent conversion to Catholicism and finally to his abandonment of the world. Here are passages from the Fathers of the Church, from the *Imitation* and the *Spiritual Combat*, from Newman and



Pusey, as well as older lights of the Church of England: but also from German and Italian poets and philosophers, from French and English writers, infidel and orthodox, Goethe, Schiller, Herder, Dante, Tasso, Silvio, Pellico, Rousseau, Voltaire, Gibbon, Locke, and many others . . . all quoted in the original and with definite and accurate references. For he was no student at secondhand. Yet when all came to be indexed by him on one of the last pages, they fell under a very few headings such as these:

Charity	Modesty
Contempt of the World	Mortification
Conversion	Truth
Devotion	Use of Time
Duty	Vanity of Earth
Good Works	Virtue
Innocence	Vocation

This earnest young man was to continue as a captain of the Grenadier Guards for four years longer. He was deeply attached to his uncle, General Lygon, and the Great Duke had never lost interest in the welfare of his wife's nephew. Yet within ten years of that transference to the Grenadier Guards, young Pakenham was to die of exhaustion in a sparsely furnished priory in Dublin. Fr Tenison Woods is almost the only witness who remembers conversations with him. He insists that, as a Passionist, Charles Pakenham would never speak about his former life, and its distractions. But it happened that he had to act as infirmarian while Fr Tenison Woods was in hospital; and he used to speak then of other things to occupy his mind. He describes Pakenham's personal appearance: "He had everything in his favour. His talents were of a high order, and his manner and address singularly graceful and winning. He was tall and slight, very fair and of fresh complexion. Large, clear and most expressively blue eyes, with light brown curly hair, gave his face a most youthful appearance; while there was something of such dignity and sweetness in his regular features that one could not help respecting him at the first glance." One of his early friends said of him afterwards that he had been "the gayest fellow in the regiment".

Many thoughtful young men, in all walks of life, took an interest in the Tractarian movement during the years before it collapsed with Newman's conversion. But there is no apparent reason to explain how Charles Pakenham became concerned with theological controversies. The most evident link between Pakenham and the other converts to the Catholic Church is Fr Ignatius Spencer, who came to know him later as a Passionist priest. Both George Spencer and Charles Pakenham were the sons of Earls, and both became Catholics: but there was an interval of twenty years between the conversions. George Spencer had been a country parson, occupying one of his family's livings in Northamptonshire, when he became a Catholic unexpectedly in 1830. He subsequently became spiritual director at Oscott under Wiseman's rectorship, and at the end of 1846 he entered the Passionist congregation in England as a disciple of Fr Dominic Barberi. But there is no trace of any acquaintance between Pakenham and Spencer during these years when Pakenham was still in military service. And Spencer's own letters give evidence of the decline of excitement in religious circles after Newman's conversion. In January 1846, he records that Newman was soon due to arrive at the old Oscott buildings, which Wiseman had offered him as a home for himself and his companions. Faber, with another group of converts, was already established in Birmingham, "living a primitive kind of life, very austere, in community with seven young men of his former parishioners". By June, Spencer was able to report several conversions among his own family. He noted that the stream of converts was now "not so fast as at one time last year, but fast enough". The public excitement was dying down.

These developments, however, were chiefly centred in the remote Midlands. The Puseyites, who had withstood the stampede which followed Newman's conversion, had been consolidating their forces, with Archdeacon Manning of Chichester as their most trusted guide. Young Pakenham appears to have been brought into touch with the Tractarian atmosphere by some unnamed military friend, whom his biographer describes as "an Anglican of devout habit of mind, who one day persuaded Pakenham to accompany him to one of the leading Puseyite churches in London: Margaret Chapel, once the scene

of Oakeley's pastorate, and since the fruitful mother of many a convert". The chapel was later replaced by the modern church of All Saints, Margaret Street, in Westminster. Oakeley had already followed his friend Newman at this time in submission to Rome. He had been succeeded by Upton Richards, who continued to attract a distinguished congregation. Pakenham began to attend the chapel constantly. He went to confession to Richards, became a regular communicant, and began to practise mental prayer, with a special affection for the *Imitation of Christ* and for the writings of St Alphonsus Liguori. Religious controversy had not abated, though the stream of conversions which followed Newman's surrender had died down. No record survives of who Pakenham's friends were, except Upton Richards. But in the summer of 1849 he went to call on Bishop Wiseman at his new country house near Hastings, after Wiseman had been transferred from Birmingham to London as Vicar Apostolic of the London District. But he appears to have felt no necessity for making any definite change of his allegiance, until the following year.

He had been influenced, strongly, by Newman: because he read constantly the volume of Newman's *Parochial and Plain Sermons* between the years 1847 and 1850. His copy shows his marginal comments and underlinings, and at the end of each sermon are pencilled the dates when he had read them at different times. Later, during his brief years as a Catholic, he used to say "it was Newman who taught me the beauty of religion. I gladly embraced his teaching. Fasting, prayer and constant attendance at church, became my delight." He began to fast in earnest; as Newman and his disciples had done at Littlemore. On Fridays he would take no food whatever until evening. Fr Ignatius Spencer can scarcely have known him at this time, but he writes with apparent knowledge of these last years of Pakenham's military career. "He braved the censures of the world," says Spencer, "by following up all alone his religious exercises, without concealment yet without ostentation, in the midst of his comrades, though he once declared, when the question was asked him, that such was the high breeding and gentleman-like feeling in the regiment that not one contemptuous or unpleasant remark was ever passed upon him on this

account by others, not even by those who followed the most opposite course." Pakenham's mother, the Dowager Countess of Longford, had grown anxious about his increasing seriousness at this time. The family must have known that he had become a constant attendant at the Margaret Street chapel, but there was no conceivable reason to associate him with the Passionists, or with any of the Catholic missionary congregations at that time.

George Spencer's strange career had in 1846 scarcely yet reached a stage at which it would have attracted Pakenham's notice. He became a Catholic in 1830, and after some strenuous years at West Bromwich as a pioneer church builder, he had been attached to the staff of Oscott College under young Dr Wiseman's rectorship. He was gradually organizing the Crusade of Prayer for the Conversion of England, which soon dominated his whole life. At the beginning of 1847 he had entered the Passionist congregation under his friend Fr Dominic Barberi, who had been making heroic efforts to conduct missions and found Passionist houses in England. From January 1847, when George Spencer was clothed with the Passionist robes at Aston Hall in Staffordshire, he can scarcely have had time or opportunity for any private intercourse. In Aston and the surrounding district, during that year, there had been a large influx of Irish labourers seeking escape from the famine in Ireland. Typhus broke out among them; and one after another of the few Passionist priests with Fr Dominic contracted the plague and were in danger of death. As soon as Spencer had recovered, he was continuously engaged in giving missions until the end of the year, when he was solemnly professed: thereafter, he was occupied constantly in giving missions or retreats with long hours in the confessional. He could make no plans of his own, even for a few days ahead. His journeys took him to Ireland and through Lancashire and the Midlands, with hurried visits to London on special business. Yet at the beginning of 1850, which was to be the year of Pakenham's submission to Rome, George Spencer must have attracted wide attention, especially among the titled families who sympathized with Lord Spencer on the eccentric behaviour of his brother. He had begun to wear his Passionist clothes openly everywhere, when religious costume

was almost unknown. The Passionist robes meant sandals with bare feet, and a long black tunic with the Sacred Heart and the Passionist emblems emblazoned boldly on the front.

Spencer had decided, in pursuing his crusade of prayer for England's conversion, that he would call personally upon public men of influence and ask their approval. In February 1850 he went boldly to wait upon Lord John Russell as Prime Minister, announcing himself to a surprised footman as Lord Spencer's brother. The interview was quite friendly, though it cannot have produced much result. At the same time Spencer went also to call upon his sister, Lady Lyttelton, who was a Lady-in-Waiting at Buckingham Palace. A letter written by her after his visit indicates how Spencer's appearance was regarded, and how keenly Charles Pakenham's action in joining the Passionists must have distressed the Longford family when he followed Spencer's example a few years afterwards. Writing on 25 February 1850, Lady Lyttelton reports: "Caroline may have told you that I had a visit from my brother Ignatius on Saturday" (the reference to him as Ignatius was in itself a mark of sympathetic toleration). "Such a figure! I was indeed glad he called, not here (Buckingham Palace) but at No. 38, where in spite of the secluded corner, two or three people assembled to look at him. The dress, however, being of fine black broad cloth, very long and full, with an immense cape, and a white embroidery representing emblems of the Passion, is rather handsome. He wore gouty shoes (!) and an inordinate hat, like those in pictures of Spanish Friars . . . he looks better and happier than for years. And his manner, if possible, more strikingly gentlemanlike and calm than ever. His business is to induce everyone to pray for 'unity in the truth'. I represented that I disagreed with him both as to the sense of the word 'unity' and of the word 'truth'. He said that did not matter. I was to pray as he asked, and the prayer will be heard if it pleases God. His intended journey to Rome is postponed, and he stays sometime in town. He has called, with this curious point to carry, on the Bishop of London and on Lord John Russell, and is trying to get admitted at Lambeth, and at Buckingham Palace also, to speak to the respective highest authorities for the same rather visionary purpose. I think he will meet with very stoutly closed doors in both cases."

During that prolonged visit to London it is possible that Charles Pakenham met George Spencer, while he was seeking these contacts in high quarters. But Spencer's days were fully occupied with active duties. In the previous August 1847 he had been suddenly appointed as provincial of the Passionists, when Fr Dominic Barberi had collapsed from exhaustion on a railway journey at Reading. Spencer's visits to London involved constant occupations in connexion with the new Passionist house at Highgate, and with preparations for other houses in different parts of England. The unexpected interval when he had to postpone his visit to Rome in February 1850 was immediately commandeered by Bishop Wiseman, who asked him to give a three weeks' Lenten mission at St George's, Southwark, which Wiseman himself attended regularly. The close records of George Spencer's daily activities contrast strongly with the more leisured occupations of the Tractarians who had made Margaret Street Chapel one of the chief bastions of Anglo-Catholic resistance to the Romanist secession. Serjeant Bellasis had been one of the chief supporters of the chapel since 1839, when he had sided strongly with Oakeley's efforts to give a more religious character to the chapel. Bellasis became a trustee and treasurer for the fund to rebuild Margaret Street Chapel; and we may assume that Pakenham had at least become acquainted with him. The life of Bellasis gives a picture of the ceaseless discussions which proceeded among these highly placed laymen, who were still concerned chiefly to reform the Church of England, and to prove that there was no need for any secession to Rome. Upton Richards is recorded as having said to Bellasis one day, "We must improve the Church," whereupon Bellasis retorted, "No, I want the Church to improve me." They were troubled particularly by the apparent power of the Privy Council to override ecclesiastical authority in matters of faith. In March 1850, a decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council produced a sudden upheaval. It proclaimed that the Rev. Mr Gorham could not legally be prevented by the Bishop of Exeter from accepting his appointment to a parish, though he had openly professed disbelief in the efficacy of baptism.

The experience of Serjeant Bellasis, who had been so closely

associated with Margaret Street Chapel, where they both had worshipped, supplies strong clues to Pakenham's conversion. In May 1849 Bellasis had attended a course of lectures given by Newman at the first London Oratory in the Strand, and young Pakenham would surely have gone there also. Bellasis moved from his house in Bedford Square during that year to live at St John's Wood; and he there made the acquaintance of the local priest Father O'Neal, who afterwards became Vicar General of Westminster. He was a friend of Hope Scott, one of the most eminent barristers of his time, and also of Manning and of Gladstone. But they had never discussed religious questions together until February 1850, when Hope Scott suddenly told Bellasis that, if he were dying, he would send for a Catholic priest. Late in July Bellasis paid a call on Dodsworth, who spoke of Manning as "one of the most earnest and sincere persons he had ever known", but declared his conviction that even Manning felt that the Church of England was failing him, since the announcement of the Gorham Judgement. Dodsworth told him frankly that, unless authority in the Church of England could somehow be upheld, he could see no escape from submission sooner or later to the Church of Rome. These many discussions culminated in the autumn of 1851, when both Manning and Hope Scott, and Bellasis and many others, decided upon submission to Rome. Their decision followed upon another crisis, when the English Hierarchy had been suddenly restored by Pope Pius IX, and Wiseman came back to London from Rome as Archbishop of Westminster and head of the reconstituted Hierarchy. The vulgar popular outcry which protested against that restoration, and the demand within the Church of England for organized protest against the "Papal Aggression", compelled Manning and many others to define their convictions at all costs.

But Charles Pakenham had already taken his decision a year earlier, in circumstances which were no less dramatic. He had already visited Wiseman, during one of his brief absences from London at Hastings, in the summer of 1849. In the summer of 1850 the Gorham Judgement had convinced him once and for all that the Church of England lacked authority and discipline. He had a final discussion at the Margaret Street Chapel with



Upton Richards, who told him that "of course it is useless to stay in the Church if you have lost faith in her system". Then he went again to see Wiseman at Hastings, and was received as a Catholic by him on the feast of the Assumption, 15 August 1850. When he went to invoke Wiseman's assistance at that time, he can have had no inkling of the dramatic developments concerning Wiseman's future which were then impending. A letter had recently reached Wiseman from the Pope's Secretary of State, Cardinal Antonelli, informing him that he was to be made a Cardinal at the next Consistory, in September, and instructing him to leave London for Rome within a month. Wiseman assumed inevitably that this summons could only mean that he was being recalled from his work in England, to reside in Rome as the Pope's special adviser on English affairs. He wrote almost desperately to his friend Dr Russell of Maynooth: "In September the Consistory is to be held which binds me in golden fetters for life, and cuts off all my hopes, all my aspirations, all my life's wish to labour for England's conversion in England, in the midst of the strife with heresy and the triumphs of the Church."

Among these "triumphs of the Church" which might be directly attributed to Wiseman's personal exertions, was the religious conversion of many men of influence or members of distinguished families. For Wiseman to receive a nephew of the Duke of Wellington as one of his latest converts would have been in any circumstances an outstanding event. It was on the very day before Wiseman's departure for Rome that Charles Pakenham came to be received as a Catholic. During the previous week Wiseman had even obtained a farewell interview with Lord John Russell, as Prime Minister, to discuss the problem of British diplomatic representation at the Holy See. He had explained that he was then "about to leave England without intention of returning". But these were closely guarded official secrets; and young Captain Pakenham can have had no idea what fateful decisions were impending when he made his profession of faith in Wiseman's presence on that August day. Wiseman's copy of the *Ordo* for that year is still extant: and its diary contains brief entries in his own handwriting, which record his movements during these fateful weeks. On 16 August he

reached Arras, and he proceeded by coach to Rome, where his nomination as Cardinal was duly published on 30 September. He had discovered by then that the Pope's intentions were quite different to what he had expected. The English Hierarchy was to be reconstituted at once, and he was to return to England as its leader, a Cardinal and first Archbishop of Westminster. The sequel was a violent outburst of Protestant hostility in England, against what was called the Papal Aggression; and this vehement reaction in turn produced a second wave of secessions to Rome from the Church of England, which was comparable to that caused by Newman's capitulation five years earlier.

Pakenham's decision had apparently been precipitated by the Gorham Judgement, which had been a subject of intense controversy since the spring of 1850, when the former leaders of the Tractarian party, who had hitherto stood firm, issued a joint protest against it. Among the many High Churchmen who were deeply stirred by the controversy was the Rev. Thomas W. Allies, who had been for a time secretary to the Bishop of London, until he incurred disapproval for his Romanist views, and was transferred to the obscure vicarage of Launton in Kent. Allies had been in close private correspondence with both Newman and Manning during the earlier Tractarian crisis, and he continued to correspond with Manning about the Gorham Judgement. In an effort to clarify his own ideas on Church authority, he then wrote a book which he entitled *The See of Peter*. It was published in September, the month after Pakenham's conversion. The book had been written while Allies was still an Anglican; but just before its publication Allies preached his last sermons at Launton and then went with his wife to Birmingham, where they were received as Catholics by Newman. It is curious to find that in Pakenham's commonplace book for the period just after his own conversion, there is transcribed a quotation from this book, which had been written before Allies took the final plunge. The passage runs:

Whither then shall I turn but to thee, O glorious Roman Church, to whom God has given in its fulness the double gift of ruling and teaching? Thine alone are the keys of Peter, and the

sharp sword of Paul. On thee alone with their blood have they poured out their whole doctrine. Too late have I found thee, who shouldst have fostered my childhood and set thy gentle and awful seal on my youth; who shouldst have brought me up in the serene regions of truth, apart from doubt and the long agony of uncertain years. . . . But now I see that the God of Elijah is with thee. O too long sought and too late found, yet be it given me to pass under thy protection the short remains of this troubled life, to wander no more from the fold, but to find the Chair of the Chief Shepherd to be indeed the "Shadow of a great Rock in a weary land".

Like Allies, Pakenham had been thinking intensely on the lines which are here indicated. His biographer quotes him as having stated, at a later period, concerning his conversion, that he had felt himself to be in real danger of losing faith in Christianity. "I did not leave one moment too soon," he said. "Already some of the leading Tractarians had made their choice between Rome and infidelity in favour of the latter. And I began to fear for my faith. Yet it was a hard fight, because the spirit of irreligion had sunk so very deeply into society in England that I stood quite alone. I met no sympathy anywhere. My uncle advised me to travel. My brother Lord Longford was amazed at my mental anxiety about such a trifling matter. My favourite sister wished me to see a very high authority on the Roman question, but on inquiring his name I found that it was the Rev. Tresham Gregg, one of the very men who, I may say, had driven me out of the Church of England. It was a hard struggle for me who had nothing, in a pecuniary sense to lose by the change. What then must be the difficulty where Rome means penury or almost starvation?"

Since his father's death some twenty years earlier, his closest personal ties were with his uncle, General Lygon. Pakenham went to stay with the General at his country place, Spring Hill, in Worcestershire. He could not hope there to find any Catholic society or even religious facilities; for even today Catholic churches and missions are few and far apart in the thinly populated districts. The new Hierarchy had not yet even been constituted; and there was only one Vicar Apostolic for the whole

Midland district. It is unlikely that Pakenham was even yet aware that, within a few months after his becoming a Catholic, a new religious foundation was being opened at Broadway, only three miles distant from where General Lygon lived. The Passionists had been given the house, which they now called St Saviour's Retreat; and they were about to open it as their novitiate, in spite of desperate anxieties for funds and future resources. In 1847 Fr Ignatius Spencer had been appointed Provincial of the Passionists in England, after Fr Dominic Barberi's sudden death. Spencer had no gifts whatever for administration, and he spent his days chiefly in giving missions or in begging for funds, and recruiting for his great Crusade of Prayer for England's conversion. But he had to preside at all important functions; and there were three new houses opened by him in that year 1850. On 24 March he had opened St Anne's retreat at St Helen's in Lancashire; on 7 October he opened the new novitiate at Broadway, so convenient to General Lygon's house; and before Christmas the Passionists also took possession of St Wilfrid's, Cotton Hall. Pakenham may have actually attended the opening of this new Passionist foundation in October, after he had become a Catholic; but he was still occupied as a captain in the Grenadier Guards. But he must have soon discovered that Mass was being said, and would be available for visitors, within an easy walk of his uncle's house.

He must certainly have heard that Ignatius Spencer had been there at the opening, because Spencer's activities at this time were exciting comment widely. His wearing of the Passionist robes in public had always been regarded with disapproval among the older Catholics, who felt that it provoked ridicule and hostility. When the Papal Aggression agitation assumed a menacing form at the beginning of November 1850, there was a general consensus that provocative gestures should be avoided. In December the newly appointed Bishop of Liverpool, Dr Brown, even wrote to the Bishops' agent in Rome, Mgr Grant, to complain that Spencer's behaviour was causing trouble. "Very bitter feeling has lately been aroused among the people here," wrote Bishop Brown. "The other day Fr Ignatius Spencer was violently assaulted by two 'roughs', and in another street was hustled and finally thrown down into a cellar full of

people. I have told him several times that he ought not appear in public in his habit but he has not thought well to heed my observations." Spencer reported to his own superiors that he would obey any orders from his Institute to abandon his religious robes, but he would otherwise continue wearing them, and would simply avoid places where the local bishops did not approve his doing so. Spencer's family were very conscious of his behaviour, but they had always regarded him as an amiable eccentric. His sister Lady Lyttelton wrote to him at the end of January 1851 saying the royal household were moving from Windsor to London about the middle of February, and she "looked forward with pleasure to an occasional visit. I am much obliged to you for telling me of the intended change in your dress. I should never have guessed its probability, having erroneously believed it simply illegal; but I find that was a mistake. I beg you to visit me at my own little home, No. 38 St James Place, and not at the Palace, when you are looking so remarkable. I don't want to figure in a paragraph: and so novel a sight in the Palace might lead to some such catastrophe."

By this time Pakenham was making a prolonged visit at General Lygon's house, and had begun to attend the Passionists' Chapel at Broadway regularly on Sundays. The Superior, Fr Vincent Grotti, invited Pakenham on several occasions to meet his little community; and on Ash Wednesday he made a definite request to be allowed to make a few days' retreat in their house. He began the religious exercises in Holy Week; and by Wednesday he approached Fr Grotti with a request for admission to the Institute, not as a candidate for the priesthood but as a lay brother. The Institute's rules prescribe strictly that the admission of any member of a noble family should have a longer preparation than others, but Pakenham's insistence and manifest earnestness prevailed. At Easter it was agreed that he should return as a novice to Broadway, after he had completed his arrangements. On returning to London, he resigned his staff duties and sold his commission in the Guards. The price was apparently £2000, and he handed it over as an endowment to the Passionists for a village school in Broadway. The rest of his property he divided among various charities, the bulk of it going to a congregation of nuns whom he knew to be in

great financial difficulties. The severing of family ties was more difficult. His mother begged him not to disgrace and embitter her old age. His sisters were evidently aware of George Spencer's recent activities, and were appalled that Charles Pakenham should desire to enter one of the very few congregations which made itself conspicuous by wearing religious garb. One of his sisters is reported to have said, "I wish he were dead; but the worst of it is we shall be like the Spencers, who have not only the sorrow of losing their near relative, but the shame of seeing him go about barefoot, like a dirty mad mendicant, begging prayers for the conversion of England."

In saying good-bye to his relatives around London, he went to call on his uncle the Duke of Wellington. The Duke was now eighty-two, and extremely deaf, but still keenly alive to what happened around him while he spent most of his time at Walmer Castle. It may be doubted whether the old Duke had any clear idea of what sort of life his nephew proposed to adopt after resigning from the Guards. But there is no doubt of his friendly feeling. A tradition in the family declares that the Duke was alone in showing any sympathy with his nephew's decision. "You have been a good soldier, Charles," he said; "strive to be a good monk." General Lygon must have been well acquainted with conditions around his own home in Worcestershire; where the Passionists already had their village school and Fr Ignatius Spencer had been making himself conspicuous. The General urged him strongly to postpone any sudden decision and to travel abroad. Charles Pakenham spent the last weeks with him after settling his affairs in London, and one Saturday afternoon in early May he rode out to Broadway. He there handed over his horse to the groom and entered the little monastery as a postulant.

He took the name Charles Mary, and when, a few years later, the founder of the Passionists, Fr Paul of the Cross, was beatified in Rome, Charles Pakenham then got permission to change his own name in religion to Fr Paul Mary. But he had to proceed through the usual routine of menial duties and austerities, first as a postulant, and then as a novice for a year. His request to be admitted as a lay brother had never been taken seriously; and although he renewed it a year later, he

was accepted as a candidate for ordination. His health had in the meantime caused great anxiety and he had feared that he might be compelled to abandon the monastic life. He recovered sufficiently to be ordained and sent to Rome and finally to Dublin; but it must have been apparent that he was unlikely to live long.

At the end of April 1852 Fr Spencer was back at Broadway as provincial, and for two weeks he acted as novice master, the position that he liked best to fill. In a report to his Father General in Rome, he said that the novices were "not so numerous as they were, but their religious spirit is excellent, a great tribute to Fr Flavian. I think too that for this we are indebted in great part to the example and influence of Confrater Charles (Pakenham)". He added significantly his opinion that Pakenham "will be much more useful to the Congregation in the spiritual than in the temporal sphere". George Spencer knew well that Pakenham's social connexions would be mentioned everywhere, as his own had been; and he realized how unsuited he had been himself for the administrative tasks of provincial, which were thrust upon him because of his social status. Pakenham's brief career as a Passionist developed inevitably on similar lines. While he remained as a novice at Broadway he was visited occasionally by some of his titled relatives, and permission was given for him to see them. He was even allowed once to accept the General's persistent invitations to visit his home nearby. But after his profession in June 1852 he went on to St Wilfrid's in Staffordshire, later well known as Cotton College, and there completed his studies for the priesthood. Illness again interrupted his course, but he was able to resume work, and in the early months of 1855 he received minor orders in London from Cardinal Wiseman. In September he was ordained at Oscott by Bishop Ullathorne. He was then sent out to Rome to complete his studies at the central house of the Passionists. But within eight months he was recalled to assume charge of the first Passionist foundation in Ireland.

In fourteen years since the first arrival of the Passionists in England under Fr Dominic Barberi, there had always been difficulty in attracting English or Irish priests. The Passionist houses were still staffed chiefly by Italians. The Rosminians,



who had been operating on similar lines since the arrival of Fr Gentili, had been more successful in recruiting Irish and English priests, and also converts. But George Spencer had been the only conspicuous English priest who had attached himself to Fr Dominic's community; and he had in consequence been made provincial for England when Fr Dominic died. His successors had seen the necessity of finding new sources of recruits for the Order. Both Passionists and Rosminians had soon discovered the possibilities of opening new missionary centres in Ireland, where they received many invitations to give missions. Fr Matthew Collier, who at that time was a curate at Rathmines, had given much help to Fr Gentili in organizing his first missions in Dublin and elsewhere. He gave similar help to Fr Vincent Grotti after Fr Dominic's death, and set himself to find a house where the Passionists could establish a centre near him in Dublin. On the outskirts of Dublin, beyond Rathmines, Fr Collier found a suitable property available at Mount Argus, and negotiations for its purchase were completed in May 1856. For the rectorship of the new house in Ireland, the choice of Fr Pakenham was almost inevitable. He had attracted attention everywhere since his admission to the society by his earnestness and rigorous austerity and simple devotion to discipline. He had even been appointed vice master of novices for a time, before he was yet ordained. Since he went to Rome, the superiors there had opportunities of judging his character and his possibilities. As a young Irishman, a convert, and a member of a well-known landowning family, he was obviously designated to fill the same role in Ireland as Ignatius Spencer had done in England.

It was not yet a year since his ordination to the priesthood, and he was almost entirely without experience in giving retreats or missions outside a religious community. His most prolonged formative training had been his twelve years in the army with regimental duties. He had scarcely visited Ireland since his boyhood; but he had never lost his feeling for the Irish traditions of his family, and a close friend was to say of him after his death that "he had his country's history at his fingers' ends". He was appointed to take charge of the new foundation and sent back to England from Rome in the summer of 1856. He arrived in Dublin in time to take formal possession of Mount Argus on

15 August 1856; just six years after he had been received as a Catholic by Bishop Wiseman.

Pakenham himself now said the first Mass in the small temporary chapel of the house; but within a few weeks steps were being taken to provide a proper chapel for the numbers who wished to attend. In November he took part, with Fr Grotti and others, in holding the first mission given by the Passionists in the big new parish church at Rathmines. It was the first public mission he had ever given; and half way through the week heart trouble obliged him to desist. He resumed daily preaching soon afterwards but his strength was obviously failing fast. Shortly before Lent he collapsed with violent symptoms of heart and liver trouble, which the famous doctor Sir Dominic Corrigan found to be incurable. He had been announced as making an appeal in the Jesuits' church, at Gardiner Street, on behalf of the Poor Clares and their orphanage at Harolds Cross. But he died at Mount Argus on 22 February, the morning that the sermon was to be delivered, and George Spencer had to deputize for him and announce his death to a crowded church.

It had been a keen disappointment to George Spencer that Pakenham had never been inspired by any enthusiasm for his Crusade of Prayer for the conversion of England. Spencer went to Germany and Hungary, and to France and Belgium and other countries, meeting bishops and others and seeking their co-operation in his Crusade of Prayer. He had gone repeatedly to Ireland with the same object. Yet he had felt from the first foundation of Mount Argus that his own special purposes were not being promoted. For some six months, from the late autumn of 1856 onwards, Spencer had made Mount Argus the base of his many missionary activities. In a letter which he wrote at that time at Mount Argus he confessed sadly that "as to the Passionists I do not think those who managed our coming here, which was all done during my absence in Germany, had any idea of serving England. I believe the prime instigator of the move was Fr Paul Mary, who was born in Dublin, and was through and through an Irishman in his affections, though trained in England. He to the last had all the anti-English feelings which prevail so much through Ireland, and never would give me the least hope of his being interested in England.

I fall in, notwithstanding that, with all the notions of his great virtue and holiness which others have: and I think moreover that the best Catholics in Ireland are to be found among those who have been the most bitterly prejudiced against England. But I think there is in reserve for them another great step in advance, when they lay down this aversion and turn it into divine charity in a heroic degree." Spencer was seldom so outspoken in expressing his disappointment at the lack of response to his Crusade in Ireland. It was a strange irony that he should have expressed it most strongly in describing the Duke of Wellington's nephew, whose life had been spent almost entirely in England.

DENIS GWYNN

## MORALISTS AND PSYCHIATRISTS

A PRIEST'S pastoral work forces him to ponder the measure of subjective responsibility in the moral conduct of men and to ask himself to what extent it corresponds with the objective norms laid down by the moral theologians. The impossibility of speaking to a selected and restricted audience has long prevented me from discussing this question publicly. Now, however, the problem is apparently debated very openly, and not always with the happiest of results (cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, November 1956, pp. 678-82). This being so, it may be useful to present a rapid survey of the whole matter.<sup>1</sup>

Two groups of specialists hold a professional brief to speak about human responsibility, the moral theologians and the psychiatrists.<sup>2</sup> Their approach is different. The theologian,

<sup>1</sup> I am greatly indebted to Dr John Marshall for many suggestions and much helpful criticism. The responsibility, however, for anything that I say in the course of the article is entirely mine. It is important that the article should be taken as a whole, no sentence or paragraph being taken by itself without reference to the rest.

<sup>2</sup> The lawyer is concerned with legal responsibility, i.e. responsibility in the eyes of the law. This may be either criminal or civil. Questions of moral responsibility enter more frequently into criminal cases than into civil cases for damages. The element of moral responsibility in crime and to what extent it is considered can be seen in any commentary on the M'Naughton Rules. Cf. *Catholic Medical Quarterly*, July 1956: "Criminal Responsibility."

once he has established that man has an intellect, will and *appetitus sensitivi*, proceeds on the whole *a priori*. He furnishes us with the blue-print for judging the conduct of the "normal" man whom we might well call the "text-book man". The psychiatrist starts with the individual case and is concerned to restore normal mental functioning by the principles of his own medical art and science: he is not primarily concerned (often not concerned at all) with moral responsibility. But, among his cases, he encounters people whose mental abnormalities clearly interfere with their reason. Of some he concludes that this interference is such that they are not always responsible for what they do.

Let us give a brief résumé of the moral theologian's view of man's moral activity. I shall speak only of human imputability in wrongdoing and not in virtue.<sup>1</sup> For a person to be responsible for the sinfulness of an act the theologian demands that he shall have knowledge of the object of his activity and know that it is sinful; that before acting he shall deliberate whether to act or not; that, having such knowledge before it, the will decides on the act. A point in these conditions which seems to me to receive too little attention in the text-books is the necessity for the individual to know that the act is sinful, i.e. forbidden by God under pain of separation from Him. There must be actual knowledge (realization) of the activity itself and a virtual awareness of its sinfulness.<sup>2</sup>

When we turn to the factors which may lessen, or even blot out, the imputability of a sinful act, we have but to follow the conditions already mentioned and see what circumstances can intervene to prevent their becoming effective in a particular case. As to knowledge of the act and its sinfulness, obviously ignorance (real and not affected) of either will rule out sin

<sup>1</sup> To keep this article within bounds, we shall be dealing only with activities which objectively are *seriously* sinful: so that reduction of the guilt to that of a venial sin, will, in our context, arise only from the imperfect nature of the elements which go to make up a human act.

<sup>2</sup> The terms "actual" and "virtual" are here applied to knowledge by analogy with the use of these terms in respect of intention. Thus actual knowledge is an act of the intellect being exercised *now* and virtual knowledge is knowledge which is in the background of consciousness and so has its bearing on a person's present way of acting though *as an act inducing the state of knowledge*, it was elicited some time ago. Some might wish to call this also actual knowledge and I should agree provided it is not thought necessary that it should be in the forefront of the mind.

though, if it be avoidable ignorance (*vincibilis*), there will be sin in the measure in which the ignorance itself was culpable.

When we come to deal with the other factors which can detract from the morality of a human act, we encounter a more complex situation. The principal of these, concupiscence, may be *antecedent* or *consequent* to the choice of the will. The concupiscence which is consequent on the choice of the will obviously does not detract from the subject's responsibility, and we have therefore only to consider antecedent concupiscence which precedes any act of the will. The influence of this antecedent concupiscence is sometimes said to be directly on the will, but even writers who say this, when they come to speak of its *modus operandi*, clearly say that it acts on the will only through its interference with the operation of the intellect. Its influence is perhaps best described by Sporer (Tom. I, tr. I, c. II, sect. IV, subsect. IV: pp. 107-108 in ed. 1897 Paderborn):

... these passions of concupiscence are an obstacle to deliberation and impartial judgment by the intellect and make it give more appreciation and weight to the reasons and motives for the thing desired, less weight to the reasons to the contrary, by inducing a kind of blindness; indeed, if the passion of concupiscence or anger is very strong, it can so upset the intellect and blind it through its being solely occupied with consideration of the desired object that deliberation, consideration or apprehension of the reasons to the contrary are quite impossible, as happens in those who are mad or drunk.<sup>1</sup>

Obviously, therefore, antecedent concupiscence lessens imputability and may sometimes entirely eliminate it. Certainly antecedent concupiscence, which completely destroys the faculty of reasoning for the time being, will prevent all imputability but it is not possible to formulate any general rule for estimating degrees of imputability when the impact of antecedent concupiscence is less violent.

<sup>1</sup> *Experientia notissimum est, quod passiones illae concupiscentiae impediunt intellectus deliberationem et iudicium indifferens ac faciunt, quod intellectus magis aestimet ac ponderet rationes ac motiva pro parte concupita, minus vero ponderet ac velut caecutiatur circa rationes in oppositum; immo potest vehemens passio concupiscentiae vel irae adeo intellectum perturbare et sola objectis concupiti consideratione occupatum excaecare, ut non possit omnino deliberare, considerare vel apprehendere rationes in oppositum, ut fit in furiosis vel ebriis.*

Antecedent concupiscence is not to be confused with that state or situation, foreseen and voluntarily induced, in which a person knows beforehand that rational judgement will become impossible. Many such instances can easily be imagined. For instance, a man may know that certain circumstances of companionship, etc., will lead him to excessive indulgence in alcohol, causing drunkenness. It is, I think, true that, when he actually takes the "one over the eight" that carries him over the borderline into a state of drunkenness, he has not sufficient clearness of judgement for the deliberation necessary for mortal sin. Nevertheless he is guilty of the sin of drunkenness because he foresaw what would happen before he started on the night's revels: and in deliberately choosing the cause he also chose the effect which was his eventual drunkenness. Not that every case of drunkenness is as clear-cut as that.

Besides ignorance and concupiscence the moral theologians enumerate violence and fear as possible factors in lessening or eliminating culpability in an act which is objectively sinful. To these we may add terror which is extreme fear. We need not dwell further on these factors since in their influence on intellect and will they follow the same course as concupiscence.<sup>1</sup>

It appears that some writers hold, or have held, that in most cases sexual irregularities are not subjectively mortal sins though they admit them to be objectively such. My knowledge of what these writers have said is gathered entirely from *THE CLERGY REVIEW* (September 1953, pp. 566-8; May 1955, pp. 295-7; November 1956, pp. 678-82; January 1957, pp. 62-3) as I have not read their works. I should be very sorry if I were to do them any injustice, but it will be understood that I am concerned solely with the views as set forth in the references just listed and am not even attempting an appraisal of the works of Oraison or von Gager.

According to *Theological Studies* (quoted in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, November 1956, pp. 678-80) Oraison, in a work that has since incurred official censure, appears to deny imputability not only in most cases of masturbation but also in the

<sup>1</sup> An act done on a sudden impulse would also be free from blame. Whether such an impulse is antecedent concupiscence or an automatic reflex need not be discussed here.

vast majority of cases through the whole range of hetero- and homo-sexuality. The reason alleged appears to be a lack of completeness in the consent, though the precise element which is missing does not seem to be specified. While I am sure that judgement of individual cases is very difficult and often impossible to make with certainty, yet I am equally sure that it is wrong to make a *general* assertion that these sins, as *Theological Studies* puts it, "must be presumed in the vast majority of cases to be only material mortal sins". In detail, one can say certainly that *a priori* that there will be greater probability of this happening in cases of solitary abuse. But even there certainty will be hard to come by. In cases which involve another person it is, of course, possible that the final act may be lacking in deliberate consent but, taking the situation as a whole, it seems rather more likely that there will normally be serious guilt. But we must really consider each case separately. In this regard, what I have said *supra*, p. 4, par. beginning "Antecedent concupiscence . . ." is of the utmost importance.

Von Gagern apparently takes the same view as Oraison and, as quoted in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, November 1956, p. 680, he gives a different and precise reason. The person concerned, according to von Gagern, "is quite unable to grasp the moral weight of what he does; he simply does not realize mortal sin" and "the majority" of such "would utterly repudiate the idea that they do anything contrary to the will of God or desire to separate themselves from Him". Rather like the common criminal, described by Chesterton's poet detective, who is "a conditional good man. He says that if only a certain obstacle be removed—say a wealthy uncle—he is then prepared to accept the universe and to praise God." Surely it is true that in *all* sinfulness the sinner lacks the appreciation of what mortal sin is, for who can understand evil? If such an outlook were right, then only in direct hatred of God, elicited by one who believed in God, would mortal sin be found. And even then—would such a person be sane?

Those who favour these new views might agree with all this and argue that it only shows that mortal sin is practically non-existent. An attractive theory without doubt: but tradition, to put it no higher, seems to say very definitely that there is *de facto*



such a thing as mortal sin, occurring not infrequently, which separates a man from God and which, unless repented of, entails eternal separation from Him. It may be, and to my mind is indeed a fact, that subjective mortal sin (though committed not infrequently) does not occur as often as has sometimes been supposed. But I think that the *general* reason for this is different from any of those given. I would not allege a *voluntarium imperfectum* in respect of each particular act (though I do not rule that out in individual instances) but rather the widespread ignorance of what morality is—well exemplified in the retort of the woman taunted by her enemy as she returned from church on a Saturday night: "You're taking advantage of me because you know I'm in the state of grace. But wait till Monday!" In other words it is not apprehended that the prohibition of an act is anything more than a kind of technical direction, almost the same as the order to fill in some official form. It may be objected that this is no different from von Gagern's "he simply does not realize mortal sin". But I think there is a profound and essential difference. Von Gagern, as quoted, appears to hold that this realization is impeded by the unsettling effects of passion, and that seemingly only in sexual matters, in the individual case. I would contend rather that there is such a general ignorance of morality, and indeed of God, that very often people just do not realize what morality or sinfulness is. I do not say that everyone is like that or even a majority. We must not forget St Paul's Epistle to the Romans i, 19-27. But the more we have been taught to know God and realize our duties in the use of created things, the greater is our moral responsibility and the greater the likelihood that disobedience will be a mortal sin even if we do not, and indeed cannot, "realize mortal sin".

What I have said so far applies to the "normal" man. Let us turn our thoughts now to the "abnormal" man, the psychotic and the neurotic. It is perhaps necessary to point out that the classification of people into normal and abnormal is somewhat arbitrary and artificial, especially if we include neurotics among the abnormals. A clearly diagnosed case of psychosis quite definitely establishes a person as abnormal. But the neuroses do not provide a clear-cut and well-defined category of abnormals.

Neurosis may in some cases scarcely interfere with normal behaviour: in other cases it may be completely disabling, by psychological and even somatic interference with normal processes of mind and body. But, whatever the abnormality, the general rule for assessing moral responsibility holds good, viz. that the psychotic and neurotic are free from moral responsibility in the measure, and only in the measure, in which their abnormality renders impossible the mental factors that go to make up a human moral act. It is about these elements that we must enquire—true knowledge, the power of deliberation and choice—but we must not expect that our enquiry is always going to lead to certainty. If any of these factors fails, or in the measure in which it fails, the psychotic or neurotic will be entirely lacking in moral responsibility or his responsibility will be diminished. Thus the question can, in theory, be decided by the blue-print of the moralists once the psychiatrists supply the information (if indeed they can) about the degree of interference with these mental powers. Let us see if it is possible to know the extent to which psychiatrists can supply this information.

Abnormal states of mind can be broadly divided into the psychoses and the psychoneuroses, although for the latter we shall in this article use the more common and shorter term "neuroses".<sup>1</sup> There is a difference of opinion as to whether psychosis and psychoneurosis differ radically or only in degree. Psychosis differs from neurosis mainly in that the psychotic is not in contact with reality: his thought and actions are not in accordance with the factual world. The neurotic, on the other hand, lives in our real world and his abnormality lies in his faulty response to the real difficulties which life presents. We will consider the psychotic first.

The psychotic moves, as I have said, wholly or partly in an unreal world. But, as a living human being, he has to act in our real world. The outward manifestation of his abnormality arises from the fact that his actions in the real world find their motives in his own unreal world. People direct death-rays at him and in

<sup>1</sup> I am not concerned in this article with the origin of these abnormalities of mind, that is to say, whether they are psychogenic or organic. They can, of course, be either or both.

self-defence he must attack these aggressors. Though in theory he might apprehend his action as wrong, it would seem in practice that his lack of balance really prevents his having the appreciation, deliberation and power of choice which are necessary for a moral act. If we would go further than that, and try to define the limits of his responsibility or irresponsibility, we shall find the lawyers as a body determined to confine his lack of responsibility to the area of activity covered by his psychosis and the psychiatrists rather holding that his lack of mental balance, though it shows itself clearly only in one particular direction, nevertheless affects his activities in a much more general way and perhaps detracts from, or even obliterates, his moral responsibility in all that he does. Between the two, the moralist will naturally remain in a state of doubt, leaning perhaps, according to his temperament and experience, to one opinion or the other.

When we turn to neurosis, the matter is not nearly so simple. We enter a much wider field and, if we are considering the impact of neurosis on moral responsibility, the difficulty is increased in *immensum* by the greatly varying extent and manner in which neurosis can affect conduct. It can increase to a *pathological extent* the various factors which (when speaking of "normal" people) we have already enumerated as reducing or eliminating responsibility in human acts—ignorance (or erroneous ideas), concupiscence, fear—and that without putting the people concerned into the psychotic category. These factors can certainly reduce imputability though we shall generally have to be content to leave it to the judgement of God to estimate just how much responsibility remains. It may even happen that responsibility is entirely eliminated. When we are considering a neurotic, not a psychotic, it will rarely, if ever, be possible to say with certainty that all responsibility is absent. But in a severe neurosis it may well in fact be so.

There is one category of neuroses which has some special relevance for our present topic, that of compulsions and obsessions. Examples of this are familiar to all: the tap-turners, the make-sure-the-door-is-locked addicts, the washers, and so on. With the majority of these there is no true irresistible compulsion. If we could say to one of them: "If you touch that tap,

you will get a fatal electric shock", he would be able to refrain from giving the tap that little turn "to make sure". But there can be no doubt that there are some neurotic compulsions which are irresistible. Can they be recognized as such? Rarely, if ever. And we have to be content to accept that even in matters of morality. There may be some clear cases, such as some of acute claustrophobia, when we can say that there is a true compulsion. Perhaps the psychiatrist could help in making some assessment of the degree of compulsion, but generally he declares himself as not concerned with moral responsibility—until he comes into collision with the lawyers in criminal cases. Even in such cases, if he is an expert witness for the defence, all he has to aim at establishing is a doubt about responsibility, though he will sometimes lay claim to certainty. But if he is willing to consider moral matters purely as such and not in any legal context, I think that the psychiatrist will occasionally say that responsibility in a neurotic is certainly absent, but more frequently that it is impossible to make any certain pronouncement: in the latter category of cases he will often hold that imputability is diminished though neither he nor the moralist will be able to say to what extent.

It would seem then that, if any act or habit of masturbation is to be declared free from serious moral guilt, it will be because of the normal obstacles to imputability—ignorance (including erroneous ideas), concupiscence—which in a neurotic subject may be almost habitual and may affect the person to an abnormal or pathological extent. There may be here, too, a neurotic compulsion but that too will interfere with imputability by inducing one or other of these obstacles to responsibility.<sup>1</sup> While I would incline to the view that serious guilt will often be absent, I should scarcely ever feel certain that this was so in any particular case.

As to sexual irregularities involving another person, particularly when they are habitual, it is more difficult to visualize the obstacles to imputability, considered in the last paragraph, as applying—at any rate in the same measure. For the "normal" run of cases, I think that what I have written *supra* p. 4 (par.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Prof. G. Santori, *Appunti di Sessuologia per Educatori e Sacerdoti* (Rome, "Orizzonte medico" publications, 1956), p. 57.

beginning "Antecedent concupiscence . . .") is very important. For the rest there can be no doubt that irregular hetero- or homo-sexual conduct of an habitual kind is frequently the outcome of a neurosis. That does not imply that imputability is ruled out but there can undoubtedly be neurotic obstacles to imputability, or full imputability, not only through a pathologically excessive concupiscence but through erroneous ideas such as, for instance, those of the love-comes-first kind. Assertions of that kind, offered as reasons, are no doubt often humbug but they can be sincere especially in the case of stupid or ill-instructed people.

To sum up, we may say that, although psychiatry or psychology can tell us that, in certain mental states of an abnormal (but not necessarily infrequent) kind, a man's power of choice in his acts may cease or be diminished, it is rarely possible, except in the case of psychotics, to make a *definite pronouncement as to the absence of responsibility in a particular case*. Yet we must not be unwilling to grant the charity of uncertainty as to responsibility—a charity which we extend willingly and without stint in our conversation when we are speaking of certain unfortunate groups. Human motives are at best unspeakably complicated and mental processes in the neurotic tend to be still more tangled. The normal person, when he is normal, may do wrong and know it and acknowledge his guilt. We cannot always judge the abnormal person but we can and should help him.

I have said nothing in this article about the pastoral treatment of those who are involved in the difficulties we have been considering. Actually I have written a good deal about it but have decided that the Editor could not be reasonably asked to accept more than I have already given.

A. BONNAR, O.F.M.

---

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

VALIDITY OF EXTREME UNCTION OF A SINGLE SENSE

Is the sacrament of Extreme Unction administered validly by the anointing of a single sense with its respective form? The case I have in mind is that in which the administration is interrupted after the first anointing, and the short form is not used. (Q.)

REPLY

Canon 947, §1: "Unctiones verbis, ordine et modo in libris ritualibus praescripto, accurate peragantur; in casu autem necessitatis sufficit unica unctio in uno sensu seu rectius in fronte cum praescripta forma breviori, salva obligatione singulas unctiones supplendi, cessante periculo."

The essence of the sacrament of Extreme Unction has been the subject of an age-old dispute, the stages and convolutions of which are very clearly and fully unfolded by Cappello.<sup>1</sup> Many of the older Schoolmen taught, not all equally clearly, that the five unctions were necessary to the validity of the sacrament;<sup>2</sup> and even as recent a writer as Billot thought this more probable. Not a few of the older theologians, however, taught that a single unction sufficed for the validity,<sup>3</sup> and this doctrine has been accepted with practical unanimity by the moderns. The chief reasons for this unanimity are, first, the historical fact that the only element common to the various Latin and Eastern rites which the Church has recognized as valid is unction of the body, and secondly, the explicit statement of canon 947, §1, which, following upon an almost equally clear declaration of the Holy Office, 25 April 1906, has robbed the older view of any probability it may once have had.

Post-Code authors are almost equally unanimous in teach-

<sup>1</sup> *De Sacramentis*, III, n. 66 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Thus St Thomas: "... ideo illa unctio ab omnibus observatur, quae fit ad quinque sensus quasi de necessitate sacramenti."—*Summa Theol.*, 3ae partis suppl., qu. XXXII, a. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Cappello (op. cit. n. 69) cites, with references, Sylvius, Natalis Alexander, Nicolaus Cerarius, Becanus, Vauroy, Estius, Tournely, Laymann, Coninck, Diana.

ing that a single unction of any part of the body, not necessarily the head, is sufficient for the validity.<sup>1</sup> The only remaining point of dispute, therefore, is whether the single unction must be conjoined with the general form, or whether (as in the case proposed by our correspondent, in which the form for the eyes will alone have been used) a particular form suffices. Noldin-Schmitt, Genicot-Salsmans, Aertnys-Damen and Merkelbach expressly require the use of the general form.<sup>2</sup> Cappello, Genicot-Gortebecke, Regatillo-Zalba, Vermeersch-Creusen, Coronata, and Claeys Bouuaert-Simenon neither affirm nor deny the necessity of the general form, but simply assert, without qualification, the sufficiency of a single unction of any part of the body.<sup>3</sup>

Alone among the post-Code authors consulted, Piscetta-Gennaro deals with the precise case proposed. After declaring it to be beyond doubt that a single unction, e.g. of the eyes, conjoined with the general form, suffices for the validity even outside the case of necessity, he adds: "At si, v.gr. *unos oculos iniungis, propria eorum adhibita formula: 'Per istam sanctam Unctionem . . . quidquid per visum deliquisti', an valide vel in ipso casu necessitatis administraveris, canon 947, §1, aperte non decernit. Sua igitur veterum sententiis hac de re manet probabilitas. Et quia versamur tantum in probabilitate facti, illicitum est vel in casu necessitatis hac posteriore ratione Extremam Unctionem administrare. Sacramentum vero ita collatum iterandum est sub conditione."*

<sup>4</sup>

Our personal preference, if it be of interest, is for the view that the term "rectius", in canon 947, applies not only to "in fronte" but also to "cum praescripta forma breviori", in other words, that it is more correct to anoint on the forehead and with the general form, when it is foreseen that there may be time only for a single unction, but that, if an anointing is interrupted after the unction of the eyes with the appropriate form for that

<sup>1</sup> Prümmer, *Manuale T.M.*, III, n. 573, might seem to imply the contrary, but the implication may well be due simply to the brevity of his statement.

<sup>2</sup> Noldin-Schmitt, *Summa T.M.*, III, n. 435, 2; Genicot-Salsmans, *Instit. T.M.*, II, n. 417; Aertnys-Damen, *T.M.*, II, n. 538; Merkelbach, *Summa T.M.*, III, n. 641.

<sup>3</sup> Cappello, *op. cit.*, n. 77; Genicot-Gortebecke, *op. cit.*, n. 417; Regatillo-Zalba, *T.M. Summa*, III, n. 655; Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome I.C.*, II, n. 231; Coronata, *De Sacramentis*, I, n. 563; Claeys Bouuaert-Simenon, *Manuale I.C.*, II, n. 182.

<sup>4</sup> *Elementa T.M.*, V, n. 1015.



sense, the sacrament will none the less be valid. It is true that this particular form, taken literally, signifies only the remission of sins committed "per visum", but one cannot therefore conclude that its effect is similarly limited; for if the particular forms were held to effect only what they literally signify, their sum-total effect would not include the remission of purely internal sins in which none of the senses had a part. It seems reasonable therefore to hold that "per visum" and the other particular phrases are illustrative and symbolic rather than restrictive, and consequently that the real effect of "quidquid per visum deliquisti", conjoined with a bodily unction, is as wide as that of "quidquid deliquisti".

Nevertheless, in the present state of opinion, Piscetta-Genaro's practical conclusion must evidently be followed. Hence, if there appears to be time only for a single unction, it must certainly be made with the shorter, more general form, and preferably on the forehead. In that case, if it turns out that there is time for the particular unctions, they must be supplied absolutely, as the Holy Office declared, 9 March 1917,<sup>1</sup> because there is no doubt about the validity of the preliminary unction. If, however, the sacrament is interrupted after an unction with a particular form, and the moral unity is broken before it can be resumed, it must be repeated conditionally, either with the short form, or with the full ritual, as circumstances indicate.

#### PARISH PRIEST AND MIXED MARRIAGE OF LAX CATHOLIC

Is a parish priest justified in refusing to apply for a dispensation from the impediment of mixed religion, when he knows that the Catholic party is not practising his or her religion and that the promised Catholic education of the children will, in practice, be confined to sending them to a Catholic school, and this only if it is convenient? May he stipulate, as I believe the French Bishops do, that before any application is made, the Catholic party shall first give evidence of good intentions by attendance at Mass and the sacraments for a period? (M. B. I.)

<sup>1</sup> A.A.S., 1917, IX, p. 178.

## REPLY

Canon 1035: "Omnes possunt matrimonium contrahere, qui iure non prohibentur."

Canon 1060: "Severissime Ecclesia ubique prohibet ne matrimonium ineatur inter duas personas baptizatas, quarum altera sit catholica, altera vero sectae haereticae seu schismatice adscripta; quod si adsit perversionis periculum coniugis catholici et prolis, coniugium ipsa etiam lege divina vetatur."

In an earlier reply to a similar question,<sup>1</sup> we emphasized that parish priests have no ordinary power, in virtue of their office, to impede marriages, and that even when, as in the case proposed, they have reason to believe that a particular marriage would, notwithstanding the dispensation of any canonical impediment, remain forbidden by the divine law, the final judgement as to the existence of this divine prohibition rests with the Holy See, or with the local Ordinary whom it has delegated to act in its behalf.<sup>2</sup> It is true that, in theory at least, a parish priest does not arrogate this judgement to himself by the mere fact of refusing to apply for a dispensation, since the Catholic party remains free to apply directly to the Ordinary; but, in practice, since few Catholics of this kind know how to make application, or would bother to do so, a refusal on the part of the parish priest will, in effect, hinder the local Ordinary in the exercise of his proper function as judge.

Needless to say, it does not therefore follow that the parish priest's function, in law, is merely to act as a go-between. From the very nature of the case, the local Ordinary must rely largely on the parish priest's testimony on reaching his decision. Hence, if the parish priest has reason to believe that the signed guarantees are not reliable, or that the alleged cause is not genuine, or grave enough, it is his duty to communicate his opinion and reasons to the Ordinary. But it would seem to follow from the very nature of their respective functions that the parish priest may not, without previous instruction or approval from the Ordinary, refuse to forward applications of his parishioners for matrimonial dispensations, when they comply, at least exter-

<sup>1</sup> THE CLERGY REVIEW, May 1954, p. 290.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. canons 1023, §3; 1031, §1, 3°; §2, 2°.

nally, with the requirements of the law. There is, of course, nothing to prevent the local Ordinary from making some such stipulation as, according to our correspondent's information, is made in France in cases of the kind under discussion, because it is a reasonable means of enabling the Ordinary to exercise his function as judge of the reliability of the guarantees; but, in our opinion, it is not for the parish priest, on his own authority, to impose a particular test of reliability as a pre-condition of his forwarding of the petition. At most, he can, and perhaps should, indicate to lax Catholics that he will be unable to recommend their petition until they show, by amendment of their way of life, that their promises are reliable.

#### POSITIVE ENCOURAGEMENT OF NON-CATHOLIC BAPTISM

(1) A child is born to a woman who is under instruction with a view to reception into the Church. Her non-Catholic husband, though not opposed to his wife's conversion, is absolutely opposed to the Catholic baptism of the child at an age when it cannot appreciate what it is thereby undertaking. Eventually, when weeks have elapsed and the baby still remains unbaptized, the mother asks the priest whether she may suggest to her husband that he have it baptized in his own church, adding that she would later see to its instruction in the Catholic faith, even if it were sent to a non-Catholic school. What advice should the priest give?

(2) In general, may a Catholic encourage or advise non-Catholic parents to have their children baptized in their own church, if otherwise they would not have them baptized at all? May he do so, even if one of the parents is a lapsed Catholic, married outside the Church, who would certainly never allow Catholic baptism? (Pseudo-Iacobus.)

#### REPLY

(1) Canon 750, §2: "Extra mortis periculum, dummodo catholicae eius educationi cautum sit, licite baptizatur (infans  
Vol. XLII

infidelium): 1° Si parentes vel tutores, aut saltem unus eorum, consentiant. . . ."

Canon 751: "Circa baptismum infantum duorum haereticorum aut schismaticorum, aut duorum catholicorum qui in apostasiam vel haeresim vel schisma prolapsi sint, generatim servantur normae in superiore canone constitutae."

Canon 770: "Infantes quamprimum baptizentur; et parochi ac concionatores frequenter fideles de hac gravi eorum obligatione commoneant."

If the prospective convert can be persuaded to bring her child to the church, it would certainly be lawful to give it Catholic baptism, because the consent of one parent suffices, and her promise to instruct the child in the Catholic faith provides the probable hope of Catholic education which the Church requires. This remains true, even if it be foreseen that the father may have the child re-baptized in a non-Catholic church<sup>1</sup> and send it eventually to a non-Catholic school.<sup>2</sup> Normally, in a case of this kind, the father should be notified of the baptism, at least in order to avoid the unlawful repetition of the sacrament, but this notification can be omitted for a grave reason,<sup>3</sup> and therefore, if the mother foresees grave inconvenience, she would be justified in bringing the child for baptism without the knowledge of the father. The priest should therefore first discover whether the mother is able and willing to surmount the difficulty in this way, bearing in mind that, once she becomes a Catholic herself, it will be her grave duty to see to the Catholic baptism and education of her child, and that nothing short of a very grave inconvenience could then excuse her.

If this method proves to be impracticable, it is probably lawful for the child to be given Catholic baptism privately at home, even, if necessary, by the mother herself. It is true that the letter of the law (canon 759) does not allow infants to be baptized privately outside the danger of death, but, as most commentators observe, the Church has admitted the excuse of other kinds of grave necessity in missionary countries,<sup>4</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Aertnys-Damen, *Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 63, quoting *Coll.S.C.P.F.*, nn. 200, 205, 200L.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Prümmer, *Manuale Theol. Mor.*, III, n. 127.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Aertnys-Damen, loc. cit.

<sup>4</sup> *Coll.S.C.P.F.*, I, nn. 593, 674.

these, as some add, can be paralleled elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> Thus Piscetta-Gennaro gives it as a general rule that "si quod impedimentum, diu duraturum, obest omnino quominus infans solemniter baptizetur, eum privatim baptizare licet";<sup>2</sup> and the same author quotes with approval the solution of our particular case offered by Genicot, who says: "Quare idem licitum censemus in regionibus nostris, quando pater, nefaria impietate, obstat ne liberi uxoris christianae ad ecclesiam deferantur baptizandi. Poterit ipsa mater (si neminem alium tuto et commode adhibere valet) infantem suum baptizare."<sup>3</sup> The priest's duty therefore, in this case, will be to ensure that the baptism is validly administered, and that, as canon 742, §1, prescribes, "two witnesses are present, or at least one, through whom the conferment of baptism can be proved".

(2) Our correspondent's second question poses a wider and more difficult problem. It must be emphasized, in the first place, that baptism, for all its vital importance, is not necessarily a good thing wheresoever and by whomsoever done. It is primarily a social act with social consequences requiring social control. Its immediate effect is to incorporate into the Mystical Body of Christ on earth. It is the door to salvation precisely because it is the door to the one ark of salvation, the undivided and indivisible Catholic Church, united under the successor of St Peter as its visible head on earth. It follows that, although this effect of incorporation, with personality in the Church (canon 87), is validly achieved wherever and by whomsoever the rite instituted by Christ is done with Christ's intention, inasmuch as there is only "one Lord, one faith, one baptism",<sup>4</sup> it is none the less contrary to the will of Christ that it be done without the authorization of His Church, and even more so when the external result is a false allegiance. Since these evils are involved in every heretical baptism, however righteous the intention of the participants, it is objectively an evil thing. One may rejoice over the sacramental effect, but one may not positively will the unlawful means.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Cappello, *De Sacramentis*, I, n. 138: "In nostris regionibus interdum verificari potest necessitas propter iniustas leges civiles."

<sup>2</sup> *Elementa Theol. Mor.*, V, n. 176.

<sup>3</sup> Genicot-Gortebecke, *Instit. Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Ephesians iv, 5.

One's answer to the general question must therefore depend on the position one takes in the perennial controversy as to the lawfulness of advising a lesser evil to a person who cannot otherwise be deterred from a greater evil. Those who hold it to be lawful *simpliciter* will presumably allow positive encouragement of heretical baptism, as a lesser evil, when the only alternative is the complete omission of baptism. Since this is the majority opinion in this controversy, it is certainly probable and can safely be followed.<sup>1</sup> Our own preference, however, is for the view that the lesser evil may be positively advised only when it is already contained in the greater evil intended by the person advised. Since this cannot be said of heretical baptism, which is an evil specifically distinct from the sinful neglect of baptism, we consider that *positive* advice or encouragement of heretical baptism is not lawful, more especially if one of the parents advised is a lapsed Catholic. In addition to implying recognition of the minister's claim to act on behalf of the Church, it would seem moreover to involve active co-operation "in sacris acatholicorum" such as is forbidden absolutely by canon 1258, §1.

It does not, however, follow from our point of view that one should always and positively *discourage* the practice of baptism among *bona-fide* non-Catholics. On the contrary, it seems to us both lawful and, *secluso scandalo*, advisable to stress the importance and value of baptism, even when the foreseen, though not positively recommended, result is morally certain to be baptism into a heretical sect.

L. L. McR.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to E. T. Hannigan, S.J. (in *Gregorianum*, 1949, XXX, p. 104 ff.), out of 48 authors of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries, 13 defend the absolute lawfulness of advising the lesser evil, 23 admit it with reserves, 12 reject it outright. Out of 51 authors of the nineteenth to twentieth centuries, the comparable figures are 35, 12, and 4.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Silence in Heaven. A Book of the Monastic Life.* Crown 4to. Pp. 68 + 90 photographs. (Thames & Hudson. 35s.)

Nor long ago we read how the monks of the Grande Chartreuse were being disturbed in their silence and solitude by hordes of trippers. Such curiosity to contemplate those who have vowed to contemplate God alone may have the happy result of a greater esteem for the hidden life and a greater awareness of the earnest purpose of human existence. But often it is curiosity and nothing more. Faced with this problem of the intruding sightseer the monks of the French abbey of La Pierre-qui-Vire conceived the plan of issuing a photographic record of the monastic life which he could study in the quietness of his own home and from which it was hoped he would gain a truer and fuller knowledge of the cloister than he could possibly gain by a fleeting visit. The ninety full-page plates have been most beautifully executed by Braun et Cie, Mulhouse. They represent the final choice out of a thousand photographs taken, and they were selected because it was felt that they best captured what the Editor calls "the perceptible element of the divine".

The photographs are arranged in nine sections. Each section is introduced by a short quotation from the writings of monastic saints, St Benedict chiefly, since most of the plates are of Benedictine monks, but also St Bernard, St Teresa and St John of the Cross. In addition, the letterpress explaining the meaning of each plate is usually clarified by an appropriate text from Sacred Scripture or from some monastic writer.

The first section, entitled *The Call of the Wilderness*, serves as an introduction to the rest; in a few studies of the eremitical and cenobitical life it conveys something of the atmosphere of solitude, silence and poverty which the peruser will feel as a deepening influence as he goes further into the book. Since prayer and work are the axes of the monastic life, the second section is devoted to the work of the monks, both manual and intellectual; and the third and fourth to prayer, liturgical and mental, and to spiritual reading which is one of the main tributaries of prayer. Sections five and six are concerned with profession and its preparation. The next two deal with the *Opus Dei*, in which the laborious, adoring and communal life of the monk finds its fulfilment. The ordinary office and the splendour of the Pontifical Office are both portrayed. But, lest the reader should carry away a final impression of grandeur as the



culmination of the life of the cloister, the final section emphasizes by various symbolic pictures the lesson of the introduction, that silence, solitude, peace and a true hold of the earnest purpose of human life are the deep and permanent feature of monasticism.

The French text has been competently translated by Phyllis Cummins. Thomas Merton contributes an English essay, *In Silentio*. The burden of it is the working of the Spirit of God in the wilderness: the Spirit moving over the primeval waters to bring light and life where darkness and lifelessness had reigned; the Spirit coming upon Christ at His baptism and then leading Him into the wilderness to fast and pray. There, says the writer, we have the image of the monastic vocation.

It is in the wilderness that the monk realizes his native poverty and nothingness; on them in the wilderness the Spirit works, and the fruit of His activity is the light and life of wisdom. But it is always a hidden wisdom, hidden with the hiddenness of God. Hence to the monk who experiences it, it ever remains something of a mystery; indeed more strangely mysterious, the more deeply he savours the hiddenness of God. As a novice he had his future life explained to him and he felt that he understood it. But, as he begins really to live the life, he finds that it eludes his grasp. He is in a strange world, a world intangible, invisible, inaudible. Wisdom sings inexpressibly and unendingly in his heart; the song she sings is the song of the silence of God. "The monastic life," writes Father Merton, "is a life wholly centred upon this tremendous, existential silence of God, which nobody has even been able to explain, and which, nevertheless, is the heart of all that is real." The monk is dedicated to public prayer; but the value of that prayer comes not so much from its sound as from the deep silence of God which enters into the sound and gives it actuality, value and meaning. Here Gregorian chant has a special pregnancy. Its measured rhythm, beautiful in itself, leads the soul by its beauty into the infinitely more beautiful silence of God. As it is in the monk's prayer, so too is it in his work. Whether he makes or mends he hears all the time from eternity the creative silence of God.

No summary can do justice to this great essay. Father Merton is a gifted poet as well as a distinguished prose writer. He here uses all the power of his imagination to express the inexpressible and give the reader an insight into the mysterious soul of contemplative prayer. The essay crystallizes the best in the writings of the author.

The publishers and printers are to be congratulated on a very handsome production. But an unusual spelling occurs twice on p. 41: "procede". And it is unfortunate that the blurb should say

that the photographs and the appropriate texts reveal the spirit behind all religion, independent of the restrictions of dogma.

*The Lord.* By Romano Guardini. Pp. xi + 535. (Longmans. 28s.)

MANY beautiful lives of Christ have been written. None, however, can be adequate to their subject; the Word made flesh eludes our search. Mgr Guardini points out in his preface that we can have a psychological study or a historical biography of St Francis "at least to the point where something beyond mere human nature stirs". But neither, except in the most limited measure, is possible of Christ; for the core of Christ is the *mysterium Dei*. The author therefore suggests that it is more profitable to turn to the Gospel story and savour it in prayer; to pause reverently before this word or act of the unique Figure, ready to learn, adore and obey.

But Mgr Guardini's pausings are no mere points of meditation. This is not just one more meditation book; it is a series of prayerful, devotional discourses, full, rich and penetrating; and we may well envy those who Sunday by Sunday for four years had the privilege of sharing the thoughts of a master in Israel.

Mgr Guardini divides his subject-matter into seven parts. The first part, *The Beginnings*, opens with Christ's origin and ancestry and concludes with the beatitudes. The second, *Message and Promise*, continues the Sermon on the Mount and carries the consideration down to the discourse of Christ with Nicodemus on baptism. The third, *The Decision*, is given to those aspects of Christ's life and teaching which led to His rejection first by the authorities and then by the people; and the fourth, *The Road to Jerusalem*, those experiences, notably the Transfiguration, and discourses and prophecies by which He prepared His followers for the end. The fifth concerns the events of Holy Week; and the sixth the Resurrection, Christ's transfigured state, the Ascension, and His eternal priesthood. The seventh part, which is particularly valuable, is a profound study of the Apocalypse as revealing the ultimate and eternal part of Christ's life.

Faith is the basic theme of this book. Faith, says the author, is the only way to meet Christ. "He steps out of eternity, the unknown, an immeasurable Being, revealed to us bit by bit through the word of His messengers or through some personal trait." "There is no norm for Him; He is the Establisher of all norms." But once we renounce all personal judgement, letting Scripture speak with the full weight of its authority, every line of the New Testament suddenly comes alive.

The American translation is good, but the spelling remains American even in this English edition. The book is beautifully printed by photolithography.

*Mystery and Mysticism. A Symposium.* Pp. 137. (Blackfriars Publications. 9s. 6d.)

APART from a short article by Ian Hislop, O.P., the studies in this symposium have been translated from the French. They are contributed by theologians of distinction in exegesis or patrology or mysticism. They have a twofold theme: one, the determining of the Christian use of the terms "mystery" and "mysticism"; the other, the correct interpretation to be given to the psychological descriptions of mystical prayer. The first article, by A. Plé, O.P., on *Mysticism and Mystery* is a kind of *status quaestionis* briefly covering the points to be elaborated in the subsequent studies.

Christianity expanded in a Greek milieu. Naturally, therefore, pre-Christian Greek religious terms passed into Christian usage. It has often been contended that this adoption of terms indicated the infiltration of Greek religion into Christianity to the corruption of the pure, simple Gospel of Christ. In this debate "mysterion" and the cognate adjective "mystical" are of particular moment; and it is necessary to the defence of Christianity that the sense in which these terms were used by Christian writers should be accurately determined.

In two articles Louis Bouyer, Cong. Orat., carefully assesses the meaning of the terms. Their currency was too common for Christian writers to avoid them, had they wished to do so. They were in fact handy terms. But the meaning given by the Fathers to "mysterion" and kindred words was quite different from the pagan Greek connotation. The pagan mysteries are known, in spite of the secrecy in which they were shrouded, to have been merely ritual mysteries; they had no doctrinal content. But the Fathers from the beginning use the terms in a doctrinal sense. Holy Scripture is mystical, particularly for the Alexandrians; but the mystery is Christ. His foreshadowing in the Old Testament, His redemptive mission in the New. Then, by a natural extension, other fundamental doctrines involved in the Person and mission of Christ are called mysteries; for instance, the Trinity, or the Eucharist. This latter, as having a ritual context, comes somewhat closer to the Greek idea of mystery. But the difference is profound; the Eucharistic ritual is seen as the shrine of a doctrine, and, as for all subsequent ages, the mystery of faith.

But in addition to this biblical, doctrinal and sacramental use,

mystical was also applied, by Origen first of all, to the form of prayer in which God is known by experience. But this usage did not become common before the writings of pseudo-Dionysius in the fifth century. This writer has often been charged with giving a neo-Platonic direction to Christian prayer; it is one more count in the indictment that Christianity was lastingly perverted by Greek influence. But whatever be the dependence of pseudo-Dionysius on Plotinism, he "baptized" it; he took his captors captive. The setting of his mysticism is the Eucharist, and he is therefore a faithful heir of the orthodox Fathers who established the biblical and sacramental usage of mystical.

Mystics have looked on St Paul, along with St John, as their great forerunner in the apostolic age. But some authorities have queried his claim. L. Cerfaux in a masterly exposition of St Paul's Epistles puts the matter beyond doubt. The Apostle had an intense spiritual awareness of union with Christ ("spiritual" is a favourite word of his). Visions, revelations, prophecy and other phenomena rightly called mystical accompanied the union. St Paul was charismatic beyond the measure of his contemporaries. But these phenomena, says the author, "are only privileged moments when his contact with the Spirit becomes overpowering". The contact itself was continuous. It was in the strength of this constant and conscious union that St Paul was enabled to exercise his unwearied apostolate. The author calls the union apostolic mysticism; the technical term would be mixed contemplation, and that of the highest order.

By far the longest and most comprehensive article in the symposium is *Studies on the Phenomena of Mystical Experience*, by A. Léonard, O.P. It is, in fact, too comprehensive, covering so much ground in a limited survey that the ordinary reader, who has little or no acquaintance with the writings of the authors reviewed, will have difficulty in following him. Add to this that the survey is not very clearly schematized. Père Léonard approaches his subject from the psychological and not the theological angle. It is a legitimate approach since the existence of mystical experience is not a revealed but a historical datum. He finds that most psychological studies of mysticism outside the Church have an undercurrent at least of Kantian philosophy. They are valuable for the important questions they raise; but they end in a cul-de-sac. So, for example, Schleiermacher who identifies mysticism with a vague, subjective and emotional religion which in his eyes is the core of all the world's faiths and is nothing more than a sense of the infinite. So, too, Ritschl and in general the orthodox Lutherans, who, in opposition

to Schleiermacher, accept Christianity as true, but Christianity conceived in the Protestant sense as a religion of good works inspired by fiducial faith in Christ. In such a religion they grant no place to mysticism. Dean Inge, according to the author, occupies a *via media* between this Protestant anti-mysticism and rationalism.

The fact of mystical prayer is too well authenticated to be questioned. But Catholic mystical prayer must be found to be at home within the dogmas and the institutional nature of the Church. This point, says the author, von Hügel rightly insisted on; but he erred in identifying mystical with ordinary religious experience. That they are not identical Père Léonard maintains can be discovered even when approached from the phenomenal angle. Mystical knowledge is a distinct kind of knowledge, springing, however, from the supernatural structure of the faith. In the true contemplatives, mystical prayer is always found embedded in the liturgical and sacramental life of the Church. But the author rightly insists that contemplative prayer should not be explained purely in terms of the liturgy, as though its horizon were bounded by the sacraments and the social activity of worship. This too narrow a view seems to be held by Stolz and other Catholic writers who have a paramount interest in the liturgy; it ignores the individual psychological character of the contemplative prayer of, among others in recent centuries, the great Spanish mystics.

This is very definitely a very important book. Incidentally we look forward to the publication of the *Oxford Lexicon of Patristic Greek*, to which Père Louis Bouyer acknowledges his indebtedness in his article on Mysticism and which will make abundantly clear the specific Christian use of pagan terms.

*The Living Bread.* By Thomas Merton. Pp. 132. (Burns Oates. 12s. 6d.)

FATHER MERTON divides his book into five sections: Christ's love and man's response; the Christian Sacrifice; the Real Presence; Christ the Way and Holy Communion; union with Christ through the Eucharist and the Church. The note of optimism which is characteristic of the author is much in evidence with such a subject to discuss. It is not so satisfying a book as some the author has written; but the style is as charming as always, and the exposition of eucharistic doctrine is clear and simple. But the book "is not a defence of a doctrine but a meditation on a sacred mystery". The finest parts are the sub-section on the Soul of Christ in the Eucharist, and the final section on man's incorporation through charity in the Mystical Body. Father Merton sees in the Eucharist the great

means devised by God for gathering together and unifying mankind, dispersed by original and actual sin. Therefore, if our life in Christ develops, as it ought, into a fully eucharistic apostolate, he sees a hope of a dawn that has never before been seen. "We live, perhaps, on the threshold of the greatest eucharistic era of the world—the era that may well witness the final union of all mankind."

J. C.

*The Mass in Transition.* By Rev. Gerald Ellard, S.J. Pp. x + 387. (The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1956. 45s.)

In his preface to this splendid book the late Archbishop Edwin O'Hara quoted these words of the present Pope to the International Eucharist Congress at Rio de Janeiro in July 1955, setting forth the chief aim of the liturgical movement and of the Pope's own work for the Sacred Liturgy that "there would not be among the faithful one person who did not take an active part in the Divine Sacrifice on the Lord's Day". Only very slowly, especially in these islands, are Catholics beginning to understand that they are called upon to take an *active* part in divine worship, that they are actors in, and not mere spectators of, the great drama of the Mass; that in and with Christ, Priest as well as Victim, and with the celebrating priest, his visible vicar, they are to offer sacrifice to God.

It is difficult to get Catholics to realize that, with Christ as leader, they are to play their part—as sharers through Baptism and Confirmation in his priesthood—in the worship of the Mystical Body which is the Liturgy. For over half a century now the Church has been endeavouring to bring this about and it is the story of this attempt and its partial success that Fr Ellard tells in *The Mass in Transition*.

In 1948 Fr Ellard wrote a striking book entitled *The Mass of the Future*. In it his prophecies about liturgical reform were bold and, at that time, a little startling; they seemed to some too ambitious and even fanciful, yet many of them have now found fulfilment and his present book is an assessment of the existing state of liturgical development, and the progress it has made during four pontificates. Hence the aptness of the portraits of the four popes from S. Pius X to Pius XII found in the present book and reproduced, in miniature, on the dust cover. Of absorbing interest is Fr Ellard's outline of the great events in the modern liturgical life of the Church which he calls "The First Fifty Years" (p. 330)—actually it runs from 1903 (the accession of S. Pius X) to 1956. Of particular interest are the chapters on the Lay Priesthood (6), the New Architecture (7), Living Art (8) and Choral Speaking (10). This last chapter deals

with the history of the Dialogue Mass and gives in schematic form its development. Fr Ellard does a great service to his readers by reproducing important and precious liturgical documents such as the Fulda Directives for Church Buildings (p. 119), the Pastoral Letter of Cardinal Cerejeira (Lisbon) on Church Architecture and the Modern Spirit (1953) (p. 128), the Letter of Pius XII to Cardinal Innizter (Vienna) for the International Congress of Catholic Church Music (1954) (p. 210). He even gives the general decree of *S.R.C.* on Simplifying the Rubrics (1955) and the Papal Encyclical on Sacred Music (1955). Each chapter of the book has a twofold bibliography, one of ecclesiastical documents bearing on its subject matter, another of books concerning it. There is an excellent general index—which is so important in a work of reference like this book—and a most useful index of events and documents of liturgical importance from 393 to 1956.

*The Mass in Transition* is a very stimulating book, quite literally packed with titbits of liturgical lore; no one who is interested in the liturgical movement should fail to read it and profit by its wisdom.

*The Bible and the Liturgy.* By Jean Daniélou, S.J. Pp. x + 372. (University of Notre Dame Press, 1956. \$5.25.)

THIS book forms Volume III of the University of Notre Dame Liturgical Studies—whose general editor is the Reverend Michael A. Mathis, C.S.C.—and contains the substance of lectures given by Fr Daniélou at the liturgical summer school of Notre Dame in 1950. It appeared in French in 1951 with the title *Bible et Liturgie*, and with the descriptive sub-title (not reproduced in the English version) “The Biblical Theology of the Sacraments according to the Fathers of the Church”. Fr Daniélou is a distinguished professor in the Institut Catholique of Paris, the author of a number of original and remarkable books, and of particular note in the intellectual world for revitalizing the study of the Greek Fathers.

The Liturgy is closely related to Sacred Scripture and its forms can be properly understood only with the aid of a competent knowledge of the Bible, and especially of biblical types and figures and of the meaning given them by our Lord himself, the Apostles and the early Fathers of the Church. The Old Testament abounds in types of various kinds which prefigure the mysteries of the New Testament, and the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New Testament is brought about largely by means of symbols. The Liturgy, too, makes great use of symbols. Many of the Old Testament symbols concern Christ himself and the mysteries of His life, but an important group of the Old Testament types is concerned



with the sacramental life of the Church. It is with these that Fr Daniélou—a master of patristic exegesis—deals in *The Bible and the Liturgy*, in the light of their interpretation by the Fathers, an interpretation derived from a common tradition going back to Apostolic times.

After preliminary chapters of general explanation, Fr Daniélou devotes five chapters to the baptismal rites, the sphragis and the types of Baptism; one chapter to Confirmation; three to the Eucharistic rites and the figures of the Eucharist. There are also a number of chapters dealing with the significance of the Sabbath and the symbolism of the great festivals of Easter, Ascension and Pentecost.

Fr Daniélou's book is not easy reading, but it is well worth careful perusal. It deals very competently with a difficult topic.

*Hymns of the Roman Liturgy.* By Rev. Joseph Connelly, M.A. Pp. xxiii + 263. (Longmans, Green & Co., 1957. Price 28s.)

THE liturgical movement gains momentum each passing year. One result of this is the desire not only to worship with greater fervour but also to worship with greater understanding. We are no longer content to fulfil our obligation of vocal prayer by merely reciting texts much of which we do not really understand, and, if challenged, could not translate satisfactorily. The priest's chief prayer is the Divine Office, the greater part of which is poetry—the psalms and hymns—poetry much of which is difficult, and for those of us who cannot claim to be expert mediaeval Latinists none too easy to understand clearly. Hence we welcome a book like Fr Connelly's which places at our disposal, in easy and attractive form, the fruits of much learning, research and hard labour.

The hymns of the Liturgy—whose "religious value and interest lies in the fact that their contents are a witness to the faith of the Church and illustrate Christian devotion through the centuries" (p. 13)—were written over a period of sixteen centuries, from the days of S Ambrose (+ 397) to our own. Fr Connelly deals with one hundred and fifty-four of these hymns, selected from the Breviary, the Missal and the Roman Pontifical, with a few no longer in liturgical use. They are arranged in four parts—each with its own introduction—hymns for the Days and Hours of the Office, the Church's Year, the Common of Saints and the Proper of Saints. For each hymn he gives the Latin text with a translation, and with historical, grammatical and textual notes. He has wisely chosen, as best fitted for his purpose—"to give instruction to those who need it without boring those who do not" (p. 14), by providing a clearer under-

standing of the Latin text—a literal, prose translation. This by no means results in an inelegant version; his translation, while faithful, is not lacking in literary grace. His grammatical notes are of very special value. If anyone is simple enough to think that there are no grammatical difficulties in the hymns, let him have a look, for example, at verses 9–12, hymn 17 (p. 29), for the translation of which many different versions have been proposed.

This book has very useful and interesting introductory sections on the origin and development of the Latin hymn, on its metres—which are highly complicated—on accent and rhyme. There is an index of Latin authors, which would benefit by the addition of their dates.

It is of interest to note that in the *American Benedictine Review* of 1955 there is quite a spirited defence by W. Martin of the view that the author of the hymn *Alma Redemptoris Mater* (No. 30) was indeed Hermann the Cripple, the monk composer of the eleventh century. Much ink has flown on the question of the authorship of the famous hymn *Dies irae* (No. 154), and Fr Connelly accepts the commoner view that it was written by the Franciscan, Thomas of Celano (1200–1255). But in 1931 the librarian of Monte Cassino discovered in Naples a text which is, apparently, that of the Sequence, and paleographical evidence concerning the codex in which it occurs would place the composition of *Dies irae* between 1170 and 1214, when Thomas of Celano was yet a child.<sup>1</sup>

Nowadays in the matter of liturgical texts it is just impossible to be quite up-to-date, and so Fr Connelly must, in his kindness, give us in the second edition of his book, a version of the two new hymns for the feast of S Joseph the Workman (1 May).

Fr Connelly's bibliography (p. 11) and occasional references throughout his book show that he has made good use of modern scholarship on hymns. A useful addition to the list of books would be the recent *Enciclopedia Cattolica* (1948–54) edited in Rome, which has an article on each of the more important hymns.

*Hymns of the Roman Liturgy* merits a cordial welcome from the clergy, not only from the neophytes but also from the jubilarians.

J. B. O'C.

*Sermon Plans.* By Canon Howe. Pp. xxiii + 508. (Burns Oates. 16s.) FIFTY years ago priests and seminarians used jokingly to say: "If you want to know how to preach, know Howe." Among the authors

<sup>1</sup> P. Inguanez in *Miscellanea Cassinensia*, 9 (1931), pp. 5–11, and *Rivista Liturgica*, 18 (1931), pp. 277–82.

of sermon books no name was more familiar, Canon Howe's reputation having been established in the year 1898 with the publication of *The Catechist* in two volumes each of 700 pages. Since *Sermon Plans* first appeared in 1904, it has been succeeded—and largely superseded—by numerous publications of a similar kind, but its reappearance in a new edition should bring it back to its former popularity.

The book provides four outline sermons for each Sunday and Holy Day of the year, with copious examples and illustrations and hundreds of aptly chosen Scriptural texts. The author's own text remains unchanged, and is therefore inevitably out-of-date in some of its references. This, however, detracts but slightly from the present-day value of the work: preachers are unlikely to be misled by what is contrary to the New Code or to recent papal pronouncements, or by some over-bold generalizations, but they will certainly be aided in preparing sermons by the wide array of suggestions and considerations carefully arranged by the author.

L. T. H.

*Missale Francorum* (Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 257). By Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, O.S.B., Leo Eizenhofer, O.S.B., and Petrus Siffrin, O.S.B. (= *Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta*, Series Maior, 2). Pp. xxvi + 107 + 6 pl. (Casa editrice Herder, Rome, 1957. Lire 2400.)

THE Roman Liturgical Institute, of which Dom L. C. Mohlberg is president, has brought out another publication in its series of major works. After giving us last year the *Sacramentarium Veronense* (i.e. the "Leonine Sacramentary") in the same series (cf. THE CLERGY REVIEW, September 1956, pp. 568-70), it has now published a new edition of another ancient sacramentary known as the *Missale Francorum*, written in France probably in the first quarter and certainly in the first half of the eighth century. It survives in a single manuscript in the Vatican library: Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 257.

Curiously enough there has hitherto been no edition of this work worthy of its importance: all previous editions, from the *editio princeps* of Cardinal Thomasi in 1680 to the accessible reprint of Mabilon's text in Migne (P.L. 72, 317-40) were works of pioneers in liturgical studies. But thanks to the Roman Liturgical Institute we now have a completely up-to-date edition which will satisfy the needs of present-day scholars.

The editing of this work is in no way inferior to that of the *Sacramentarium Veronense*, either for its presentation of the text (which is far better than in Migne) or for its complementary studies, apparatus and bibliography. The only notable difference is that this volume contains far fewer pages, because the manuscript of the *Missale Francorum*

has survived only in a fragmentary state. The same accuracy and precision characterize each volume.

The appendices are full of interest. Detailed tables (pp. 41-57) indicate the *incipit* of each of the 169 liturgical formulas contained in the *Missale Francorum* and confront them with the parallels in Roman and non-Roman sacramentaries. As one of the special features of the *Missale Francorum* is its habit of joining end-to-end clauses and phrases taken from other prayers in the same sacramentary or even in different ones, it has been necessary to divide some of its collects into their component parts to indicate their sources. Much patient and careful work was needed to make this table, but it was the only method of indicating at a glance the considerable borrowing and patchwork compilation which are characteristic of the *Missale Francorum*. This table is the most important element in the book and should be constantly used in the detailed examination of the liturgical formulas it contains.

The presence in Appendix V of twenty-three prayers from an eighth century sacramentary in Northumbrian script (Berlin Öffentliche Wissenschaftliche Bibl. Ms. lat. fol. 877), whose text is very close to that of the *Missale Francorum*, is particularly welcome. It might also have been useful to add the short fragment of an Irish Pontifical, also of the eighth century (MS. Colmar 144), which has three formulas concerning Virgins and Widows in common with the *Missale Francorum*, or at least to indicate that it has been published in *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* (Toulouse), 1955, pp. 65-71.

The last appendix contains the surviving fragment of the *Walderdorffer Kalenderfragment*, likewise of the eighth century.

A table of the liturgical formulas, an index of proper names and six plates complete this excellent book. The paper is of very good quality and the print exceptionally clear, both of which are a credit to the publishers.

LOUIS BROU, O.S.B.

#### PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

and  
(57)  
l in  
nan  
s of  
and  
ven  
ects  
ent  
only  
and  
ran-  
and  
ical

an  
rlin  
t is  
me.  
rish  
has  
with  
een  
955,

lder-

and  
ood  
edit

d for  
I, in